

act:onaid

RÖPPA
Afrique Nourrière



WOMEN for WOMEN
International



WITH EVERYONE AT THE TABLE

The Global Agriculture and Food Security Program:
a Recipe for Achieving Zero Hunger

The Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) is at a crossroads. After almost 10 years of operations and successful results, it is now in need of being replenished to continue its work. The GAFSP is unique in that it includes civil society and producers' organizations in the governance of the Fund, and it currently offers the unique opportunity of direct funding to initiatives by producers' organizations. This report is a consolidated summary of several reports by civil society organizations assessing the impact of GAFSP projects on women and men small-scale food producers. It builds on the qualitative information collected through focus group discussions, interviews with partners, testimonies of farmers, desk researches, and field visits. This report provides perspectives from civil society on the GAFSP, why it should be further supported by donors, and what priority areas the GAFSP should support after the replenishment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Implementing Country-led Food Security Strategies	6
Strengthening Grassroots Organizations of Small-Scale Producers	8
Civil Society Participation in GAFSP Governance	11
Need for Improved Participation in Project Governance at National and Local Levels	12
Case Studies and Civil Society Evaluation of the GAFSP	13
<i>Nepal</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Bangladesh</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Senegal</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Mali</i>	<i>20</i>
Civil Society Evaluation: Focus on Gender	21
Continual Learning	23
The Latest Projects in Situations of Fragility, Violence and Conflict	24
Conclusions and Policy Recommendations for the GAFSP	25

Introduction

After decades of progress against hunger, we have seen three consecutive years of regression, with about 821 million people chronically undernourished.¹ This is not a surprise to anyone who has been paying attention to the food security threats posed by climate change, growing economic inequality, and conflict.

The multilateral Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) is a key innovation of the international community that has had great success in supporting food production by some of the most threatened groups. Strengthening the program is crucial for achieving Zero Hunger, Sustainable Development Goal 2 for United Nations member countries.

The GAFSP is unique because it brings together financing and policy support for small-scale food producers and their organizations, through a participatory system of governance where donors, aid recipients, expert agencies, and civil society all participate in decision-making. It convenes international anti-poverty and anti-hunger institutions, such as the UN Food Agencies and Development Banks, in a multi-stakeholder platform where they can exchange information and ideas and participate in decision-making with donor and recipient country governments, civil society, and farmers' organizations.

Contrary to popular assumption, hunger in the world is not caused by a shortage of food. Rather, specific populations of people experience hunger due to conflict, droughts and floods, persistent inequality, and a lack of access to or control over natural and other productive resources. The GAFSP was created at the request of the Group of 20 summit of governments (G20) in Pittsburgh in 2009, as a response to the 2007-2008 global food crisis that was caused by higher oil prices, increased biofuels demand, and financial speculation. The GAFSP provided major donor countries a coordinated mechanism for meeting their pledges to invest in global food security, which they made at the Group of 8 summit (G8) in L'Aquila in 2009. Contributors to the GAFSP have included Australia, Canada, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, Spain, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF).

Despite being a young program coordinated by a small secretariat, GAFSP projects have involved approximately 10 million smallholder farmers and food producers. The program has grown and evolved since 2010, sharing learning experiences among participants, donors, and supervising agencies. As of 2018, \$1.5 billion has been invested in 40 of the 58 countries declared eligible using International Development Association (IDA) criteria. GAFSP investments have extended and improved irrigation systems for small-scale farmers, rehabilitated roads, made technologies accessible, and improved family nutrition. GAFSP projections estimate that every dollar invested in public sector projects yields \$2.50 in income for food insecure families each year.²

¹ FAO et al, The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2018.

² GAFSP 2017 Annual Report p. 27.

In April 2018, the GAFSP endorsed a reform to produce a GAFSP 2.0 to better align with the United Nations Agenda 2030 and contribute to Sustainable Development Goal 2, Zero Hunger. Civil society, governments, and multilateral institutions have together created and agreed upon this vision for the GAFSP going forward:

The GAFSP is a demand-led and recipient-owned global partnership and a cost-effective and flexible multilateral financing mechanism dedicated to fighting hunger, malnutrition and poverty in developing countries. In line with SDG2 (Zero Hunger), GAFSP supports resilient and sustainable agriculture that benefits and empowers poor and vulnerable smallholder farmers, particularly women and youth.³

What makes the GAFSP unique is the innovative and participatory governance of all stakeholders in the program’s global Steering Committee. The GAFSP brings to the same table donors, recipient countries, implementing agencies⁴, civil society organizations, and small-scale food producers’ organizations. Even though civil society and producers’ representatives don’t have voting power, they are members of the Steering Committee and can participate in meetings and conversations on equal footing with donors and recipient countries.

Negotiations between all GAFSP partners resulted in the endorsement of a restructured GAFSP which now works through three tracks for project proposals: public sector projects, private sector projects, and most recently the **Missing Middle Initiative (MMI)**.

The largest GAFSP program track is designed to strengthen the national food and agricultural policies of food insecure countries through public programs and projects aimed at improving productivity and livelihoods of small-scale producers. The smaller private sector window is intended to encourage business enterprises to invest in ways that create opportunities for small-scale producers.

The Missing Middle Initiative, an innovation suggested by civil society representatives, directly supports projects developed by the membership organizations of small-scale food producers for social and economic empowerment.⁵ These grassroots organizations bring together small-scale producers, especially women, to reach different types of markets and interface with both the government and the business sector. Projects intended to address hunger in recent years tend to target governments and agribusiness and have too often not included funding for strengthening grassroots organizations. The MMI aims to bridge this gap.

³ <https://www.gafspfund.org/about>

⁴ UN Food Agencies and Regional Development Banks.w

⁵ The MMI Guidelines define the Missing Middle as Producers Organizations and Agricultural Civil Society Organizations, or “entities like POs/ag-CSOs, which have largely been unable to directly access GAFSP funds to achieve GAFSP goals. The POs/ag-CSOs have smallholder farmer groups as members or are directly connected to smallholder farmers.” See <http://www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-home/plenary/cfs43/side-events/50/fr/>

Civil society evaluations point to participatory governance and continued learning at the global level as core strengths of the GAFSP. These have yielded good results for projects which have increased food production in impoverished communities. It is important to note, however, that from the national to the local levels, many of these projects still lack the kind of participatory design and implementation which would strengthen poor communities and maximize the empowerment of participants, particularly women.

THE GAFSP REFORM IN BRIEF

In 2018 the GAFSP Steering Committee approved the reform of the GAFSP to align with the Agenda 2030 and better contribute to Zero Hunger (SDG2) and other related SDGs on climate change, health, education, gender equity, and job creation. The restructure of the GAFSP also served the purpose of further enhancing synergies across GAFSP's public and private sector activities. The GAFSP 2.0 has removed the previous structure of the Public and Private Sector Windows, with distinct modalities and governance, and replaced it with a single window and unallocated funds. Under the new structure, applicants will be able to propose public projects, producers' association projects, and projects incorporating private business, in coordination with any of the eight supervising entities. The Steering Committee will make final decisions over allocation of funds.

Implementing Country-Led Food Security Strategies

As much as one-third of the global population depends directly on agriculture, herding, or fishing for their livelihoods.⁶ Small farms sustained by family labor continue to feed most of the world.⁷ The biggest investors in primary production are farmers themselves, the women and men who invest their own labor and money in preparing and maintaining the land and farm infrastructure for growing crops, and in the breeding of domestic animals.⁸ Yet many of the crucial public goods needed to enable this production, and to raise producers above the poverty level, require public investment. This includes agricultural research and extension, roads and market infrastructure, and access to water and other inputs. Public services such as education, healthcare, and social protection programs are also necessary to ensure that rural living and food production are not synonymous with marginalization and poverty.

Historically, public investment in these areas has been crucial for addressing rural development in wealthy countries and has been key to the success of farming at all scales. However, in both rich and poor countries, public support and corporate interests have favored large-scale farming over smaller farms. This has resulted in a loss of rural livelihoods, frequently with negative social and economic consequences for displaced people.⁹ While

6 FAO. 2019. World Food and Agriculture – Statistical pocketbook 2019. Rome.

7 Etc. Group. 2017 Who will Feed Us? https://www.etcgroup.org/sites/www.etcgroup.org/files/files/etc-whowillfeedus-english-webshare.pdf_pdf

8 FAO. 2012. State of Food and Agriculture.

9 Saturnino M. Borras Jr., Ruth Hall, Ian Scoones, Ben White & Wendy Wolford (2011) Towards a better understanding of global land grabbing: an editorial introduction, *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38:2, 209-216; Lorenzo Cotula (2012) The international political economy of the global land rush: A critical appraisal of trends, scale, geography and drivers, *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 39:3-4, 649-680; Pew Commission on Industrial Farm Animal Production. 2008. Impact of Industrial Farm Animal Production on Rural Communities.

there have been decades of progress against hunger in the world, and the overall percentage of hungry people in the global population has declined, some groups are being left behind. Moreover, in the last three years, there has been an absolute increase in the number of people experiencing hunger and food insecurity, which clearly means that more must be done.¹⁰

Due to the dominant trade and structural adjustment policies of recent decades, there has been a lack of investment in public goods for rural development. This contributed to the food price crisis of 2008 and to the current rise in hunger. Countries that lost aid and neglected public investment in family agriculture, especially in Africa, face some of the greatest hunger challenges now.¹¹ Just as excess food production worldwide does not reach those who are hungry, private investment alone has not been able to provide key services and financing for vulnerable communities, or build crucial public infrastructure and address inequalities. By 2003 African Union member countries had become aware of the extent of the problem and developed the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) in which member countries pledged to invest 10% of their national budgets in agriculture. However, many poor countries struggled with this target, and a renewal of partnership from wealthy countries was still lacking.

The food price crisis of 2008 triggered additional attention to these problems, with major donor countries pledging \$20 billion for agriculture and food security at the 2009 G8 summit in L'Aquila. What was lacking was a financial instrument that would bring key institutions, governments, and civil society stakeholders to the table to strategize around the role of public investment alongside the investments of farmers and other private sector actors. Support for the GAFSP as a key conduit for shaping public agricultural investment and country-led strategies emerged from the G20 in the fall of 2009.

As of the end of 2017, the GAFSP Public Sector Window had received \$1.3 billion from nine donors and invested \$1.2 billion in 48 projects in 31 countries. Grants are allocated based on a call for proposals which makes GAFSP effectively demand-driven. Applicant countries must demonstrate a conducive policy environment such as a current comprehensive agriculture and food security strategy and an associated investment plan. Countries must also demonstrate they have made an adequate investment in agriculture, so that GAFSP funding can feature into a country's broader commitment to agriculture development. In African countries, for example, the CAADP framework and the national investment plans are key reference documents for applicants. A competitive process allows the best proposals to come through, and countries that lack the capacity to develop strong proposals can request funding for technical assistance with proposal preparation.

10 FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. 2019. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2019. Safeguarding against economic slow-downs and downturns. Rome, FAO.

11 Mark Curtis and Katie Campbell. 2014. Sowing the Seeds of Success: The Case for Public Investment in African Smallholder Agriculture. Action-Aid USA.

To date, African countries have received 63% of GAFSP funding. Over 9 million smallholder farmers and small-scale food producers have been able to enhance their livelihoods from these projects so far, with a total of 12 million expected to benefit as the projects continue. Women and girls make up 36% of all participants.¹² This illustrates that while some projects have been effective in prioritizing women, GAFSP recipient governments and implementing partners need to improve their strategies for building women's leadership and reaching more women. This is one of the areas where the involvement of civil society in GAFSP governance is key to continuous learning and to holding all participants accountable.

Strengthening Grassroots Organizations of Small-Scale Producers

The public sector track of the GAFSP is a much-needed response to years of policies in poor countries that neglected to address the problems facing food producers in rural communities. However, these programs implemented by governments can easily become overly top-down, failing to fully consider community needs or farmers' knowledge and resources. The programs also have lacked funding to strengthen the organizations that small-scale producers build for themselves. Such producers' organizations already exist in most countries, but they have very little budget or infrastructure that would allow them to interface with either the government or the private sector on behalf of their members, or to shape the larger projects in ways that would most benefit and empower their members.

Thanks to the participation of the **Network of Peasant Organizations and Agricultural Producers in West Africa (ROPPA)** and the **Asian Farmers Association (AFA)** in the GAFSP Steering Committee, along with the support of the "Northern" countries' civil society representative, there is a constant effort at the national level to develop appropriate channels to enable more effective involvement of farmer and food producers' organizations in all phases of GAFSP projects.¹³

¹² GAFSP 2018 Annual Report; GAFSP 2019 Investment Case.

¹³ "Northern" is commonly used as a euphemism in this context to refer to civil society representatives from OECD member countries who were typically former colonial or neo-colonial powers. Australia and New Zealand are in the OEDC but in the southern hemisphere.

The GAFSP has strengthened the engagement of farmers' and producers' organizations in several ways:

1. Producers' organizations, represented in the Steering Committee by ROPPA and AFA, can support the selection of proposals that best ensure their effective involvement.
2. Producers' organizations help disseminate the call for proposals at the national level and ensure that national members are part of the process.
3. Producers' organizations are informed about monitoring missions and take part in them.
4. The participation of producers' organizations in project design and implementation is a precondition for project approval/final disbursement.

The new Missing Middle Initiative, launched in November 2017¹⁴, was initially proposed by civil society representatives in the GAFSP to fill the void between small-scale producers, government-led programming, and the private sector firms. The MMI was piloted as a modest program on the Public Sector side of the GAFSP. In its first call for proposals, the program awarded funding to five projects, each disbursing between \$2-3 million directly for producers' organizations and their proposals.



The Panjor Bhanga Village Women's Dairy Cooperative in northern Bangladesh is one of 55 farmers' organizations participating in the Missing Middle Initiative. Credit: Tammy Mehdi/GAFSP

One of the most complex MMI projects is in Bangladesh, where the UN Food and Agricultural Organization is providing revolving small loan funds and strengthening the management

¹⁴ <https://www.gafspfund.org/missing-middle-initiative>

and governance capacities of 55 farmers' organizations, most of which were involved in a country-led public sector window project. Another project, implemented by the East African Farmers' Federation in three countries, gives smallholders access to critical economic services such as marketing, financial services, and extension and advisory services through the use of the mobile e-granary platform managed by smallholders through their cell phones. In Senegal, a project coordinated by two producers' organizations seeks to boost climate resilient agriculture and market access to smallholders, especially women and youth.



Members of Yakaar Niani Wulli Federation, a producers' organization in the Gambia River Valley region of Senegal, produce sweet ginger juice and couscous made from millet. They are part of the Missing Middle Initiative. Credit: Tammy Mehdi/GAFSP

In Mali, two MMI projects are being implemented. One project, supported by the World Food Programme, works with four farmers' organizations to provide additional services for their members in producing and marketing the staple food crops of rice and cowpea. In the other project, the National Coordinating Agency of Peasant Organizations in Mali is being supported by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to train and finance rural youth in producing and marketing poultry and fish.

Thanks to continual advocacy from civil society organizations, the reformed GAFSP 2.0, which will begin operating in 2020, now includes a channel for direct grants to producers' organizations in line with the Missing Middle Initiative pilot program. The value proposition of

the reformed GAFSP emphasizes that smallholder-based sustainable agriculture rather than boosting global agricultural production is the key to achieving the Sustainable Development Goal of Zero Hunger (SDG2).

Civil Society Participation in GAFSP Governance

Decisions in GAFSP about budget, policies and projects are made by the Steering Committee, which is made up of an equal number of donor representatives and regional representatives for recipient countries, along with three representatives from international civil society organizations, and eight multilateral project supervising agencies. These project supervising entities include: the three Rome-based United Nations organizations, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the World Food Program, and the International Fund for Agricultural Development; the World Bank and International Finance Corporation; and the Africa, Asia, and Inter-American Development Banks.

Decisions within the Steering Committee are made by consensus. While only the donor and recipient representatives are considered “voting members” who can block consensus, the civil society representatives have a voice throughout the process, and voting members take their proposals and concerns into account.

Civil society representation on the GAFSP Steering Committee was organized through an autonomous civil society process with the stipulation that there be no more than one representative from an organization based in the wealthier countries (defined by membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development), and that the other two are based in two different regions of recipient eligible countries. While the GAFSP was created as a G20 initiative, civil society organizations following the GAFSP have gathered during the UN Committee on World Food Security in Rome, which is the largest and most participatory gathering of governments and civil society to shape international food and agriculture policy. The Civil Society Mechanism Forum¹⁵, organized before the CFS, provides a broad space where civil society organizations from across the world can participate in the GAFSP and give a mandate to their representatives. The biannual IFAD Farmers’ Forum is another space where farmers’ organizations have interacted and defined their participation with the GAFSP.

ActionAid International has actively participated in the GAFSP since its inception, and ActionAid USA currently shares a seat on the Steering Committee with Women for Women International. The other two seats, as mentioned above, are held by representatives of small-scale farmers’ umbrella organizations from the two largest recipient regions, ROPPA and AFA. Civil society representatives on the GAFSP also engage with and hear from civil society

¹⁵ The Civil Society and Indigenous Peoples’ Mechanism (CSM) for relations with the United Nations Committee on World Food Security (CFS) is the largest international space of civil society organizations (CSOs) working to eradicate food insecurity and malnutrition. The CSM was founded in 2010 as an essential and autonomous part of the reformed CFS.

groups throughout the year at various international summits and national gatherings where GAFSP initiatives and projects are discussed.

A Technical Advisory Committee evaluates project proposals and makes recommendations to the Steering Committee. This committee is a self-organized body of experts who select members based on a nomination process which is also open to civil society.

A small and agile coordinating unit carries out the day-to-day operations of the GAFSP, often in consultation with civil society organizations, including agenda-setting, developing the documents for calls for proposals, and carrying on work between Steering Committee meetings. With supervising entities and project partners carrying out project implementation, the GAFSP has relatively low overhead costs and high flexibility.

Many actors help make the GAFSP a space for dialogue and innovation involving governments, civil society, and institutions with expertise in food and agriculture.

Need for Improved Participation in Project Governance at National and Local Levels

In 2018, GAFSP civil society participants undertook a global assessment of the GAFSP to contribute to its evaluation commissioned by the Steering Committee. The 2018 global civil society evaluation of the GAFSP noted that the multilateral program is:

More participatory and transparent at the global level than at the country level. Within many countries, farmers' organizations and civil society are seen more as beneficiaries or implementers rather than as strategic partners.¹⁶

Thanks to the continued insistence of civil society representatives and other members of the Steering Committee, new criteria for project approval, monitoring and evaluation has been established to address this weakness. **The enhanced participation of civil society organizations and producers' organizations at the country level, at any stage of the project, is now a requirement.**

GAFSP, upon the urging of and with the support of the CSO representatives in the Steering Committee, has developed **Quality of Participation Guidelines** which is used by the Technical Advisory Committee to assess the extent to which the country investment plans and GAFSP proposals were developed in a participatory manner. This guideline defines good quality participation as: (a) inclusive/representative, (b) well-planned and more than a one-off activity, (c) meaningful and transparent and (d) one that impacts project design and implementation. The Guidelines also provides indicators and means of verification for

¹⁶ Macasaet, Sixto, 2018. CSOs' Independent Evaluation of the Global Agricultural and Food Security Program (GAFSP), p. 4.

these four elements. All applicants are requested to follow these guidelines in their project formulation, and compliance is considered an asset by the TAC for the project approval.¹⁷

The civil society evaluation noted that in Asia, three countries (Nepal, Mongolia and Bangladesh) had farmers' organizations and civil society representatives seated in the national Project Steering Committee. There was also participation of farmers' organizations at the national level in at least two of the projects examined in Africa, Niger and Togo. Projects in other countries have faced resistance from governments or at the very least pointed to a need to improve civil society's involvement in both project design and implementation at the country level.

According to the evaluation:

Where farmers' organizations and civil society are involved in project design/planning, they were able to positively affect the plans, particularly in terms of identifying the needs of small-scale farmers and the approaches/methods that have already been tried and found to work or not work.¹⁸

Case Studies and Civil Society Evaluation of the GAFSP

In 2011, early in the implementation of the first GAFSP projects, civil society representatives to the Steering Committee were able to visit the Land Husbandry, Water Harvesting & Hillside Irrigation Project in Rwanda.¹⁹ This project exemplifies the potential of the GAFSP to work with civil society to create and invest in projects with high long-term impact on food security, which would otherwise not happen. The project providing communities with funding to construct hillside terraces and irrigation systems where smallholder farms had lost their fertility to soil erosion. This type of project has both immediate and long-term benefits for the food security and incomes of affected communities but would be impossible for communities to afford without public investment.

Since then, ActionAid has carried out evaluations on the progress and initial results of GAFSP projects in seven countries. While the collaboration between civil society and governments varied across and within countries, a notable trend was the strengthening of civil society engagement in the design of projects and a stronger focus on women's participation.

¹⁷ Macasaet, Sixto, 2018. CSOs' Independent Evaluation of the Global Agricultural and Food Security Program (GAFSP), p. 5.

¹⁸ Ibid. p. 17.

¹⁹ ActionAid. 2011. Field Report: Land Husbandry, Water Harvesting & Hillside Irrigation Project <https://actionaid.org/publications/2011/land-husbandry-water-harvesting-hillside-irrigation-project>



Adoh Ama sells fish in Atakpamé, Togo. Women undertake the most profitable activities (fish trading and processing) and are collectively organized. Project: PASA. Credit: Ruth McDowall/Shoot the Earth/ActionAid

In 2015, ActionAid published reviews of projects in Malawi, Niger, and Togo.²⁰ All of these projects were successful in engaging with small-scale food producers, improving their livelihoods, and strengthening their climate resilience. The projects in Malawi and Niger tackled a key need around the globe which is implementing and supporting irrigation and water management infrastructure for smallholder farmers, as well as roads and access to seeds. In Togo, ActionAid reviewed a sub-project that funded equipment needed by small-scale fish traders and processors. In these cases, funding access to appropriate infrastructure resulted in improved livelihoods, while in other cases opportunities were missed for empowering women, strengthening producer organizations, and reaching some of the most marginalized groups.

ActionAid conducted four more evaluations in 2017 and 2018, publishing case studies for Senegal, Tanzania, The Gambia, and Nepal.²¹ These projects differed considerably by country but included significant infrastructure projects to benefit vulnerable populations of smallholders including road repairs to increase market access, irrigation, fencing, animal houses, wells, greenhouses, and more. In all cases, smallholder production increased, and participants reported increased family consumption of vegetables and animal products.

20 ActionAid 2015. Is GAFSP reaching small-scale food producers in Malawi, Niger, & Togo? <https://www.actionaidusa.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/GAFSP-Summary.pdf>

21 ActionAid 2017. Is GAFSP Reaching Small-Scale Food Producers in Senegal?
ActionAid 2017. Is GAFSP Reaching Small-Scale Food Producers in Tanzania?
ActionAid 2018. Is GAFSP Reaching Small-Scale Food Producers in Nepal?
ActionAid 2018. Is GAFSP Reaching Small-Scale Food Producers in The Gambia?
<https://www.actionaidusa.org/publications/issue/food-and-agriculture/>



Rice farmer Miza Khamis Ame at Kibokwa irrigation scheme in Zanzibar, at the center where farmers bring their harvests before it is sold. Project: ERPP. Credit: Allan Gichigi/ActionAid

Some projects provided subsidized fertilizers and seeds and introduced new breeds and technologies, while others focused on locally available inputs. ActionAid's evaluation encouraged more focus on assessing, conserving and improving local breeds and seeds to ensure access and sustainability. Most of the projects were well targeted to women. Some projects focused on increasing women's production opportunities, while others went further by providing technologies to reduce their workload and encouraging more care work to be done by men.

The civil society representatives to GAFSP worked with a consultant to conclude a global evaluation in 2018.²² Global civil society organizations reviewed project reports and answered survey questions to get their views on the GAFSP. Civil society representatives in Asia and Africa reviewed a sample of the projects and conducted focus groups and interviews with stakeholders.

The evaluation determined that the projects increased both productivity and overall production in the project areas. In some cases, this increase was dramatic where crucial infrastructure, such as irrigation, had not been available. While increases were easily observable on a local level, they were not always easily quantifiable.²³ In general, however,

22 Macasaet, Sixto, 2018. CSOs' Independent Evaluation of the Global Agricultural and Food Security Program (GAFSP).

23 The GAFSP estimates the increased productivity to be around 25%. GAFSP 2019. Investment Case.

production led to increased incomes and improved food security and nutrition for families. The evaluation notes that in Burkina Faso, some families that had been eating only one meal a day were now eating two meals a day as a result of the project.



Women in Tatopani, a village in Nepal, received training to grow new food crops and include them in their diets. Project: AFSP. Credit: Lok Chandra Thapa/ActionAid

The evaluation also found major missed opportunities and concerns about the future sustainability of the gains made, especially with projects that did not involve existing farmers' organizations, focused too much on production with little or no progress made on access to markets, or promoted the use of external inputs over the use of local seeds, breeds and techniques that could be more accessible. Moreover, while women and youth were always counted in project proposals, projects often did not address the structural or systemic causes of their vulnerability. For instance, in most cases projects did not address mechanisms for increasing women's access to land.²⁴

In summary, the key to improving the projects is greater participation of civil society at the national and local levels. In particular, it is crucial to strengthen existing producers' organizations through the expansion of the Missing Middle Initiative. At all levels, projects should not only focus on women's participation of women but also address inequities in workload and care work and strengthen the role of women in leadership.

²⁴ Macasaet, Sixto, 2018. CSOs' Independent Evaluation of the Global Agricultural and Food Security Program (GAFSP).

NEPAL²⁵

Through the Public Sector Window, GAFSP has supported Nepal's **Agriculture Food Security Project (AFSP)**, which aims to improve food security and nutrition in rural areas by increasing food production, promoting nutritious diets, and supporting communities to cope with the impacts of climate change, working especially with women's groups. AFSP set out to reach nearly 162,500 families over a period of five years (2013-2017) with US\$58 million from the GAFSP and the Nepalese government.

AFSP targeted 19 districts in the Mid- and Far-Western regions, two zones most affected by poverty in Nepal, with poverty rates of 45% and 46% respectively and the lowest rates of agricultural holdings per household in the country. The project successfully reached the most vulnerable women and small-scale producers in remote districts and resulted in an increase in agricultural production, especially fresh vegetables, access to improved production technologies such as polytunnels, an increase in income, and food security and nutrition enhancement.

AFSP also strengthened local farmers' groups. Existing mothers' health groups were turned into Village Model Farm (VFM) groups with the aim of promoting education on maternal and child health and nutrition. AFSP also supported the

creation of Farmer Field Schools (FFSs) to facilitate training, experimentation, and knowledge sharing, for farmers as a group.

During AFSP's design phase, farmer representatives were engaged at the regional and national levels through consultation workshops held in regional venues. The local nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in charge of AFSP's implementation consulted farmers, including for the identification of program participants. Both men and women farmers had the space and the scope to develop proposals to apply for funding support in all activities. With support from NGO facilitators and technicians, they implemented the activities themselves through collective decisions.

For a variety of reasons, however, the farmers involved in this process reported a lack of in-depth exchange on local, indigenous food knowledge and habits. They noted that decisions taken with regard to the project did not always reflect farmers' knowledge and concerns. Though civil society organizations were involved in various ways, from implementation to project monitoring, important decisions were taken without accounting for the differing views of farmers' organizations, such as the recommendation to use local, indigenous varieties. AFSP could have benefited greatly from stronger involvement of farmers' organizations and civil society, particularly on agricultural inputs and land issues. The inclusion of human rights-based civil society organizations as stakeholders in AFSP could potentially have brought a very useful policy influence and land rights lens to the operation.

25 ActionAid 2018. Is GAFSP Reaching Small-Scale Food Producers in Nepal? AFA 2018. Csos' Independent Evaluation of the Global Agriculture And Food Security Program (GAFSP) – Asia.

BANGLADESH²⁶

The Bangladesh **Integrated Agricultural Productivity Project** was a five-year US\$50 million grant in which the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the World Bank worked with the government of Bangladesh to provide training and access to inputs to numerous producers' groups. The project was implemented in eight districts in both the north and south to boost production of several staple crops, livestock, and fisheries. This wide-ranging project was evaluated by the FAO and the World Bank to be broadly successful with significant increases in production of rice, fish, and milk. A main critique of the project is that it was not designed specifically to involve women and that, with the exception of the livestock projects, it missed opportunities to directly empower women or develop their leadership.

In addition to providing technical and leadership training to government staff and community members, the project created a large number of local producers' organizations. As a result of national and international farmer-to-farmer field visits and trainings funded by the project, some of the producers'

organizations across Rangpur and Barisa decided to organize an umbrella organization, the Sara Bangla Krishok Jote (SBKJ). The SBKJ is being further supported by the Bangladesh Missing Middle Initiative, **Increasing Access to Finance for Farmers' Organizations**, which provides training and revolving credit to 55 local producer associations. Forty-five of these organizations came out of the GAFSP public sector project, while the other 10 preexisted the project.

The civil society evaluation conducted by the Asian Farmers' Association (AFA) noted that one area of incoherence within the GAFSP was the fact that the Private Sector Window project had no connection to the public sector project and subsequent Missing Middle Initiative. Rather, it was set up in a separate area of Bangladesh by the IFC in coordination with Bangladesh's largest food processing company, PRAN, and until the time of the civil society evaluation, staff involved in these projects had no interaction. This disconnect was addressed during the reform process of the GAFSP with the result of creating a single window in the GAFSP 2.0 with different tracks where public, private, and farmer-led investments are expected to come together to produce better results.

²⁶ AFA 2018. CSOs' Independent Evaluation of the Global Agriculture And Food Security Program (GAFSP) – Asia. GAFSP 2018. Annual Report.

SENEGAL²⁷

Senegal saw the operation of both Public and Private Sector Window projects, as well as the introduction of the Missing Middle Initiative. In the Private Sector Window, the IFC sought to increase Senegalese farmers' access to finance through the **Global Warehouse Finance Program (GWFP)**. In order to help Senegalese farmers make use of safe and reliable warehousing to store crops, which they would then bring to the market, GWFP assisted banks in providing warehouse financing through risk mitigation and in developing certain finance skills.

In the Public Sector Window, the **Food Security Support Project in Louga, Matam, and Kaffrine Regions (PASA/Lou-Ma-Kaf)** worked to improve rural incomes and food security by targeting these weather-hazard prone regions. This project reached about 390,000 people, with women comprising around 40%. Though the project sought to strengthen and empower civil society organizations, civil society participation appears to have been largely limited to the project's start-up phase. The project's impact is apparent in the reduced number of women and youth leaving rural villages, the development of livestock and agricultural activities, and a reduction in conflicts between herders and farmers.

In order to promote livestock and crop production, US\$40 million were invested in the provision of water management systems, rural roads, and animal vaccination centers. The project helped develop local sales points by constructing 90 kilometers of roads and



Mayor Samba Ba with his cattle in Senegal. The development of infrastructure and water management techniques in the lowland areas makes it possible to optimize the use of water for agriculture in areas where low rainfall is one of the major climatic constraints.

Project: PASA/Lou-Ma-Kaf

Credit: Sam Phelps/ActionAid

supported producers by organizing market sites in urban centers. As a result of PASA Lou-Ma-Kaf, small-scale producers reported an increase in agricultural production and an improvement in working conditions through the establishment of collective production areas and the distribution of agricultural tools and equipment. Cattle ranchers and farmers reported an increase in income.

Additionally, producers' organizations in Senegal have seen important benefits in the MMI project, **Strengthening rural women's livelihood for sustainable economic development** in Tambacounda and Koussanar in the Eastern region of Senegal. The MMI is expected to reach more than 3,000 people, with the majority being women, youth, and smallholder producers who are members of the economic interest groups of the pertinent producers' organizations. These organizations are becoming more professionalized and will see their bargaining power, representativeness, and financing capacities enhanced through the creation of sustainable and innovative economic partnerships.

27 ActionAid 2017. Is GAFSP Reaching Small-Scale Food Producers in Senegal? Macasaet, Sixto, 2018. CSOs' Independent Evaluation of the Global Agricultural and Food Security Program (GAFSP).

MALI²⁸

Access to water and irrigation are key areas where public investment is needed in many countries, including Mali. The US\$37 million GAFSP-funded **Koulikoro Region Food and Nutrition Security Enhancement Project** is intended to reach 53,000 small-scale producers directly with irrigation and clean drinking water. Activities also include health and nutrition training for women and youth and efforts to increase their participation in the irrigation project.

The 2018 African civil society GASPF evaluation lamented that the implementation of this project was behind schedule and called for greater participation by farmers' organizations in the implementation process to follow up on their involvement in the design. Malian civil society continues to see project completion as an urgent priority and would like additional farmers to be included, especially the poorest groups.

Separately the GAFSP has responded to the proposals of producers' organizations in Mali by approving two MMI projects of nearly \$3 million each. The National Coordination Agency for Peasants Organizations of Mali (CNOP) is working with IFAD

to implement one project with the Association of Professional Peasant Organizations, the National Federation of Rural Youth, and the National Federation of Rural Women. The project **Inclusion of rural youth in poultry and aquaculture value chains** provides training and loans to 640 rural women and 1,000 youth to establish small-scale poultry and aquaculture production and to strengthen their local producers' organizations.

In the other project, **Improved rice paddy quality and quality niébé processing for improved nutrition and increased farmer development**, five local farmers' organizations are working to increase the quality of and their participation in rice and pigeon pea production, with support from international cooperative organization SOCODEVI and the World Food Programme. Both projects have the potential to strengthen the ability of rural community organizations, including women and youth, to hold the government, the private sector and international agencies accountable.

28 Macasaet, Sixto, 2018. CSOs' Independent Evaluation of the Global Agricultural and Food Security Program (GAFSP). GAFSP 2018. Annual Report.

Civil Society Evaluation: Focus on Gender

The global civil society evaluation noted with appreciation that all the GAFSP public sector projects took gender into account and involved women in the countries and communities where they were implemented.

[All of the GAFSP public sector] projects address at least one element of good gender mainstreaming for projects (gender analysis during preparation, gender-informed actions and gender disaggregated M&E) and 87% address all these three elements. Further, 35% of the 8.6 million people reached by these projects are women. It was acknowledged that the GAFSP project provided incentives for women's participation and that the project staff included a gender specialist.²⁹

However, gender inequality in societies, communities and agricultural investment and development is not easily changed. The strength of the GAFSP's inclusive governance model is that all parties, civil society organizations, governments, and the world's most important food security and agricultural development institutions can analyze and address shortcomings in future efforts. On gender, the civil society evaluation noted that:

Women were included in the GAFSP projects as partner-beneficiaries, but most GAFSP-supported projects lack focus and priority for addressing women small-scale farmers/producers' equal right to access land, water, inputs, extension services and finance and inclusion in leadership and decision-making processes.

[For example] Women in Niger were under-represented in the local management committees for the other project activities (irrigation and water systems, and agricultural production). Similarly, despite the Malawi project's efforts to increase women leadership, there were still very few women leaders in the cooperatives and associations... The Asia evaluation likewise noted that the leadership of the farmers' organization formed and/or included in the project is still dominated by males.³⁰

Small-scale Producers and Private Sector Investment

The original Private Sector Window of the GAFSP has been about one-fourth the size of the public sector program and was set up as a legally separate entity from the rest of the GAFSP. It is supervised exclusively by the International Finance Corporation (IFC) of the World Bank

29 Macasaet, Sixto, 2018. CSOs' Independent Evaluation of the Global Agricultural and Food Security Program (GAFSP), p. 13.

30 Ibid p. 14.

Group, compared with the eight supervisory entities of the Public Sector Window.³¹ The Private Sector Window received \$368 million from six donors, including two donors that did not provide support for the Public Sector Window. The IFC has used these funds to attract private creditors to provide blended financing to 66 businesses in the agriculture and food sectors and advisory services to 71 projects. According to the IFC, these projects have reached almost 1.2 million farmers in 32 countries, though only 150,000 participants were women.³²

The purpose of the private sector window is to encourage agribusinesses to incorporate targeted participants such as smallholders or women in their supply chains. The lending of public money is intended to bring in additional lending from private creditors for new agribusiness ventures. For the civil society representatives in the GAFSP, the approach of reaching smallholders through agribusiness lending raises questions about where power is concentrated in the marketplace and whether the benefits of agribusiness growth will accrue to smaller scale primary producers and workers, or whether long-term trends could be toward greater inequality. Thus far, the structure of the Private Sector Window programming has not provided as many opportunities for civil society to evaluate or participate in projects as they have had within the public sector.

After the reform, the Private Sector Window, housed within IFC and with IFC as its implementing entity, will continue to operate. The proposal of civil society organizations to simply factor it into the new structure met the resistance by the IFC based on the remaining funding and the investments still in place. In line with the new structure, the GAFSP 2.0 will support business-led, private sector financing through the business investment financing track that will offer concessional or blended financing targeted to Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) through the all eligible supervising entities.³³ The focus on SMEs is the result of civil society's push for broadening the scope of the definition of "private sector," which too often is associated with large agribusiness only. Given that small-scale farmers are the primary investors in agriculture, civil society organizations have advocated that the GAFSP should primarily support domestic farmers' cooperatives and small and medium enterprises.

Under the public sector-led financing, proposals are also encouraged to support private sector development in the applicant country, through a mandatory "opportunities analysis" to identify possible technical assistance and advisory services oriented towards opportunities to explore and build private sector engagement.

31 Japan and the Netherlands

32 IFC-GAFSP 2020. Changing Lives.

33 Existing SEs that have private sector investment arms or departments and are applying the Enhanced Blended Concessional Finance Principles for DFI Private Sector Operations



This recently constructed road in Chamen Nianija, The Gambia, allows community members like petty trader Rakey Cham to transport produce, goods, and livestock to local markets. Project: FASDEP. Credit: Mohamed Lamin Touray/ActionAid

Continual Learning

A major strength of the GAFSP is its commitment to continual learning, particularly through exchanges between participants. As a program with low overhead costs and a small secretariat, the GAFSP does not waste resources attempting to duplicate institutional research or extension resources maintained by partners such as the World Bank and the UN Food and Agricultural Organization. It is better placed to experiment with new approaches to investing in agricultural development. It takes advantage of its unique role to bring together all the institutional, governmental and civil society participants for its annual Knowledge Forums.

The GAFSP recently held a Learning Workshop in Senegal for all countries and organizations involved in piloting MMI projects, with national farmers' organizations reporting on the advances made in their projects and taking the experiences of others back to their countries to improve the work. Some of the projects, such as the one in Bangladesh, have also funded farmer-to-farmer³⁴ learning, including exchanges between countries, in order to make sure that what is being taught is fully understandable to the farmers and adapted to their own contexts.

³⁴ The Farmer-to-Farmer approach is inspired by the campesino movement in Latin America. It supports peer learning among farmers and encourages participants to learn from each other by sharing not only information and techniques but also their experiences, creativity, and know-how.

The Latest Projects in Situations of Fragility, Violence and Conflict

Given the rise in world hunger in the last years due to conflict and climate change disasters³⁵, as well as fragility as an emerging paradigm³⁶, **the GAFSP Steering Committee launched a “Special Call for Proposals” targeting countries considered to be in situations of fragility, conflict and violence.** The flexible and multi-stakeholder nature of the GAFSP made it possible to dialogue and reach agreements quickly to fund food security and agricultural projects in situations that require an immediate response to crisis. Launched in 2019, the call was open to 24 countries affected by social and environmental fragility and conflict. There was sufficient funding to approve food security and agriculture projects ranging from \$8 to \$20 million in Afghanistan, Central African Republic, DR Congo, Ivory Coast, Haiti, Liberia, and Yemen, as well as a joint proposal from Kiribati, Micronesia, Marshall Islands, and Tuvalu.

For The Gambia, grant approval was contingent upon structural changes to the project, while in Burundi, the grant was not approved out of concerns that the government was not adequately addressing human trafficking.

When implementing projects, recipient countries are invited to consider the CFS “Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises”³⁷, one of the frameworks referenced in the Call for Proposals, along with the recently launched FAO Guidance Note.³⁸ Hence, the GAFSP contributes to fostering efforts of governments to implement the policy guidance instruments developed by the CFS. Continuous evaluation and learning are needed to determine how the GAFSP should fund projects in conflict situations, but the ability of the GAFSP to respond to and shape the work of food security in fragile situations is an essential strength.

35 FAO SOFI 2019. <http://www.fao.org/state-of-food-security-nutrition>

36 “80% of the world’s extreme poor will be concentrated in “volatile countries” by 2030” World Development Report 2017: Governance and the Law

37 <http://www.fao.org/cfs/home/activities/ffa/en/>

38 <http://www.fao.org/in-action/kore/news-and-events/news-details/en/c/458150/>

Conclusion and Policy Recommendations for the GAFSP

The GAFSP moves into 2020 with a history of inclusiveness, a record of overall success in project implementation, and a need for donors to replenish its funding. For all the reasons described in this report, the GAFSP is a unique institution with a significant value-add in the landscape of funds and institutions providing international food and agriculture support. **More than any other major fund, the GAFSP provides support directly to small-scale farmers and prioritizes inclusion of civil society voices, particularly those from grassroots producers' organizations.**

ActionAid joins civil society organizations across the globe to increase support of and engagement in the GAFSP at all levels. It is crucial that governments and donors provide adequate funding for the GAFSP to reach its potential to guide the way to Sustainable Development Goal 2, Zero Hunger, and the realization of the human right to food globally.

Recognizing the crucial role of the GAFSP in global efforts to achieve both the SDGs and human rights, donors should contribute to the 2020 replenishment to allow the GAFSP to continue to support agricultural development in the poorest countries with a special attention to women's empowerment, youth employment, and agroecology as a successful tool for increasing smallholders' resilience to climate change.

In addition to a full replenishment, the following policy recommendations are directed to both donors and recipient countries to strengthen the GAFSP's contribution to the eradication of hunger:

- * Support the capacity-building of grassroots food producers' organizations at the local, national and regional/global levels and the strengthening of producers' and civil society platforms. This can be done by increasing the resources available to producers and civil society for capacity building and ensuring meaningful producer and civil society participation and representation at the various levels (local, provincial and national) and throughout the whole process.
- * Strengthen investments made by producers' organizations, by allocating more funds to reduce inequalities in the agriculture sector and directly boost farmers' organizations and cooperatives. This can be done by ensuring that a minimum percentage of total funds is allocated to proposals from producers' organizations under track 1.B of the reformed GAFSP 2.0.
- * Support private sector development, focusing particularly on strengthening farmer-owned associations and cooperatives and locally owned enterprises in order to generate in-country benefits.
- * Include women's rights, women's empowerment, and gender equality in project components to ensure women's right to own land and productive assets. Also provide technical assistance and funding and other support directly to women, conducting training sessions, forums and other activities exclusively for women and ensuring meaningful women's representation in decision-making bodies at various levels.
- * Work for a stronger agroecological orientation of the fund. This can be done by allocating at least 50% of available funds exclusively to producers' organizations for agroecological interventions, as defined by the 10 elements of agroecology approved by the 163rd Session of FAO Council (CL 163/Rep)., A thematic call for proposals focusing on supporting "agroecology transition" and aimed at grassroots producers' organizations should be issued before the end of 2020.

Annex:

Tables of GAFSP Public Sector and Missing Middle Projects

MISSING MIDDLE INITIATIVE PROJECTS (PILOT)

LOCATION	TITLE	SUPERVISING ENTITY	AMOUNT (USD)	STATUS
Mali	Inclusion of rural youth in poultry and aquaculture value chains in Mali	IFAD, CNOP, AOPP	2.62 M	Active
Senegal	Strengthening rural women's livelihood for a sustainable economic development in the eastern region of Senegal	APROVAG and YNW with FAO	2.48 M	Active
Bangladesh	Increasing access to finance for farmers' organizations in Bangladesh	55 producer organizations with FAO	2.48 M	Active
Mali	Improved rice paddy quality and quality niébé processing for improved nutrition and increased farmer development	4 producers' groups, Socodevi, Malo, WFP	2.99 M	Active
Uganda, Rwanda and Tanzania	Using the e-granary innovative mobile platform to deliver economic services to farmers in East Africa	EAFF, IFAD	2.61 M	Active

GAFSP PUBLIC SECTOR PROJECTS
(not including the newest FCV country projects)

LOCATION	TITLE	SUPERVISING ENTITY	AMOUNT (USD)	STATUS
Bangladesh	Integrated Agricultural Productivity Project (IAPP)	FAO, World Bank	50 M	Completed
Benin	Project to Support Food Production and Build Resilience (PAPVIRE-ABC)	AfDB	24 M	Active
Bhutan	Food Security and Agriculture Productivity (FSAPP)	World Bank	8 M	Active
Burkina Faso	Agricultural Productivity and Food Security Project (PAPSA)	World Bank	37 M	Active
Burkina Faso	Nutrition Sensitive Agricultural Intensification for Sustainable Food Security (PIDASAN)	World Bank	24 M	Active
Burundi	Platform for Food Security and Rural Development of the Imbo/Mosso (PNSADR-IM)	IFAD	30 M	Active
Cambodia	Emergency Food Assistance Project (EFAP)	ADB	24.5 M	Completed
Cambodia	Climate Resilience Rice Commercialization Sector Development Program (Rice-SDP)	ADB	14.6 M	Active
Ethiopia	Agricultural Growth Project II (AGP-II)	FAO, World Bank	30 M	Active
Ethiopia	Agricultural Growth Program (AGP-I)	FAO, World Bank	51.5 M	Completed
The Gambia	Food and Agriculture Sector Development Project (FASDEP)	AfDB, FAO	28 M	Active
Haiti	Relaunching Agriculture: Strengthening Agriculture Public Services II Project (RESEPA II)	World Bank	10 M	Active
Haiti	Small Farmer Agriculture Technology Transfer Project (PTTA)	IDB	25 M	Completed

LOCATION	TITLE	SUPERVISING ENTITY	AMOUNT (USD)	STATUS
Haiti	Technological Innovation for Agroforestry and Agriculture Program (PITAG)	IDB	10 M	Active
Honduras	Corredor Seco Food Security Project (ACS-PROSASUR)	World Bank	30 M	Active
Kenya	Small-Scale Irrigation and Value Addition Project (SIVAP)	AfDB, FAO	24 M	Active
Kyrgyz Republic	Agriculture Productivity and Nutrition Improvement Project (APNIP)	World Bank	38 M	Active
Lao PDR	Agriculture for Nutrition Programme (AFN)	IFAD, WFP	30 M	Active
Liberia	Smallholder Agricultural Productivity Enhancement and Commercialization Project (SAPEC)	AfDB	46.5 M	Active
Malawi	Smallholder Irrigation and Value Addition Project (SIVAP)	AfDB	39.6 M	Active
Mali	Koulikoro Region Food And Nutrition Security Enhancement Project (PReSAN-KL)	AfDB	37.2 M	Active
Mongolia	Livestock and Agricultural Marketing Project (LAMP)	FAO, World Bank	12.5 M	Completed
Myanmar	Climate-Friendly Agribusiness Value Chain Sector Project in the CDZ (CFAVC)	ADB, FAO	27 M	Active
Nepal	Food and Nutrition Security Enhancement Project (FANSEP)	World Bank	22.7 M	Active
Nepal	Nepal Agriculture and Food Security Project (AFSP)	World Bank	46.5 M	Active

LOCATION	TITLE	SUPERVISING ENTITY	AMOUNT (USD)	STATUS
Nicaragua	Caribbean Coast Food Security Project (PAIPSAN)	World Bank	34 M	Active
Niger	Water Mobilisation Project to Enhance Food in Maradi, Tahoua and Ziner Regions (PMERSA-MTZ)	AfDB	33 M	Active
Rwanda	Sustainable Agricultural Intensification for Improved Livelihoods, Food Security and Nutrition Project (SAIP)	FAO, World Bank	26.3 M	Active
Rwanda	Land Husbandry, Water Harvesting and Hillside Irrigation Project (LWH)	World Bank	50 M	Completed
Senegal	Food Security Support Project in Louga, Matam and Kaffrine Regions (PASA/Lou-Ma-Kaf)	AfDB	40 M	Active
Sierra Leone	Smallholder Commercialisation Program (SCP)	IFAD	50M	Active
Tajikistan	Public Employment for Sustainable Agriculture and Water Resources Management Project II (PAMP II)	World Bank	28 M	Active
Tanzania	Tanzania Initiative for Preventing Aflatoxin Contamination (TANIPAC)	AfDB	20 M	Active
Tanzania	Expanding Rice Production Project (ERPP)	World Bank	23 M	Active
Timor-Leste	Sustainable Agriculture Productivity Improvement Project (SAPIP)	World Bank	21 M	Active
Togo	Project to Support Agricultural Development in Togo (PADAT)	IFAD	20 M	Completed
Togo	Togo Agriculture Sector Support Project (PASA)	World Bank	19 M	Completed
Uganda	Multisectoral Food Security and Nutrition Project (UMFSNP)	World Bank	27.6 M	Active
Republic of Yemen	Smallholder Agricultural Productivity Enhancement Program (SAPEP)	World Bank	36 M	Active
Zambia	Agricultural Productivity and Market Enhancement Project (APMEP)	AfDB	31 M	Active

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Author: Doug Hertzler

Contributors: Mohammad Abou-Ghazala, Niranjali Amerasinghe, Sophia Har, Brandon Wu

Coordinator: Alberta Guerra

With inputs from Lena Bassermann and Danny Wijnhoud

ActionAid USA, 1220 L Street NW, Suite 725, Washington DC 20005

+1 202 835 1240

www.actionaidusa.org

More Action. Less Aid.

Cover photo: Adoh Ama sells fish in Atakpamé, Togo. Women undertake the most profitable activities (fish trading and processing) and are collectively organized. Project: PASA. Credit: Ruth McDowall/Shoot the Earth/ActionAid