



INTER-RÉSEAUX
DÉVELOPPEMENT RURAL

Franco-British-West African research and policy initiatives in West Africa



Relevance to rural development policies

Karim Hussein, Denis Pesche and Tom Slaymaker



GRET *iied*



00019153



Overseas Development Institute

Sharing Lessons from collaborative Franco-British-West African research and policy initiatives in West Africa :

Relevance to rural development policy and processes



International Workshop held at the Overseas Development Institute,
London
11th-12th September 2000



Co-organised by the **Overseas Development Institute** and **Inter-Réseaux**
In collaboration with **OPM, IIED, GRET** and **CIRAD**

Report by

Karim Hussein (ODI), Denis Pesche (IR) and Tom Slaymaker (ODI)

March, 2001

Printed by Russell Press, Nottingham

ISBN 0 85003 514 7

© Overseas Development Institute 2001

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publishers.



Overseas Development Institute

111 Westminster Bridge Road

London SE1 7JD

Tél. : +44 (0) 20 7922 0300

Fax : +44 (0) 20 7922 0399

www.odi.org.uk

INTER-RÉSEAUX

DÉVELOPPEMENT RURAL

32 rue Le Peletier

F-75009 PARIS

Tel : (33 - 1) 42 46 57 13

Fax : (33 - 1) 42 46 54 24

secretariat@inter-reseaux.org

www.inter-reseaux.org

GRET

213 rue La Fayette

75010 PARIS

Tél : (33 1) 40 05 61 61

Fax : (33 1) 40 05 61 10

www.gret.org

iied

4 Hanover Str.

Edinburgh EH2 2EN

www.iied.org



BP 5035

34032 Montpellier Cedex 01 France

www.cirad.fr

The research programmes and this document were funded by the UK DFID (Department for International Development) and the French Ministère des Affaires Etrangères.

Les programmes de recherche et cette publication ont été financés par le DFID (Department for International Development) et le ministère français des Affaires étrangères.



6 St Aldates Courtyard,

38 St Aldates

Oxford, OX 1 1BN England

Tél : 44 (1865) 207300

Fax : 44 (1865) 250580

admin@opml.co.uk

Note

This report presents the results of a number of research programmes funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the French Ministère des Affaires Etrangères (MAE), with contributions from CORAF/WECARD and the EC. The results and analysis presented represent, however, the opinions of the authors alone.

The report begins with summaries of workshop proceedings and programme results in French and in English. This is followed by a detailed overview of proceedings and synthesis of workshop discussions in English. A number of annexes provide further information about the workshop, programme outputs and participant contact details.

While this publication summarises outputs from projects funded by the United Kingdom Department for International Development and the French Ministère des Affaires Etrangères for the benefit of developing countries, the views expressed are not necessarily those of DFID or MAE.

Contents

Note	4
Acknowledgements	6
Acronyms	7
Synthèse Française de l'Atelier	9
English Workshop Summary	17
Foreword	25
Introduction	27
The Franco-British Initiative (FBI)	27
Why hold a workshop?	28
Workshop objectives and outputs	29
Participating institutions	29
Presentations	30
Structure of this report	30
Section A – Overview of Workshop Proceedings	31
Introduction	31
Session 1 – Process, Outputs and Results	32
Study 1: Land tenure and derived rights	32
Study 2: West and Central African cocoa policy research and analysis networking	37
Study 3: Research-Extension-Farmers' organisation linkages	40
Session 2 – Lessons from Non-FBI Initiatives	46
Non-FBI Initiative 1: Pastoral organisations	46
Non-FBI Initiative 2: Public policies in the fight against poverty and inequality	49
Non-FBI Initiative 3: EC rural development policy	50
Session 3 – Lessons for Policy	53
Working group 1: Regional issues	53
Working group 2: Issues relating to national policy	55
Additional perspectives from partners involved in the FBI	59
Session 4 – Conclusions and Taking Issues Forward	60
Panel discussion	60
Conclusions	62
Taking issues forward	63
Section B – Synthesis	65
Key issues	65
Practical lessons and pointers for future action	68
Relevance of these studies to EC, UK and French rural development policies	70
Section C – Appendices	73
Appendix 1: List of documents and publications produced by FBI Programmes	73
Appendix 2: Participant contact list	78
Appendix 3: Workshop programme	80
Appendix 4: Workshop organisers	82
Appendix 5: Further contacts	84

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the Department for International Development (DFID), UK, and the Ministère des Affaires Étrangères (MAE), France, for providing funds for this workshop. We also acknowledge the MAE and DFID funds provided for the Franco-British Initiative (FBI) programmes between 1996 and 1999, and the additional financial contributions made by CORAF/WECARD and the EC to the research-extension-farmers' organisations linkages programme. We particularly note the constructive collaboration with a wide range of West African consultant researchers and partner institutions in the programmes presented. Whilst, unfortunately, the number of West African partners able to attend the workshop was limited, we are grateful to those who did participate and to those who responded to the email consultation (see Section A, Session 3, page 59).

In particular, we thank Jim Harvey (Rural Livelihoods Department, DFID), Bruno Vindel (MAE) and Jeremy Stickings (NRIL – Manager of ASSC funds for DFID), along with Alison Kennedy (West and North Africa Department, DFID) for their personal efforts to ensure the workshop took place and their more substantive contributions to workshop preparations, discussions and detailed comments on the draft workshop report. The important role played by Felicity Proctor,¹ previously Senior Natural Resources Adviser in DFID's West and North Africa Department, in establishing and taking forward the projects under the FBI is gratefully acknowledged.

We thank all the participants for contributing materials and participating in debates. We are especially grateful to members of the collaborative projects who made time to comment on the programme, prepare summaries and presentations of their projects and attend the workshop. In particular, we mention Camilla Toulmin and Ced Hesse of IIED, Jean Zoundi (INERA-Burkina Faso), Marc Levy (GRET), Pierre-Marie Bosc and Bruno Losch of CIRAD-Tera, Jim Gilling (OPM), Jean-Pierre Chauveau (IRD) and Luc Lefebvre (ADE-Belgium). We also thank the African collaborators who took the time to respond to the email survey.

Finally, our thanks to Tom Slaymaker (rapporteur) and Sylvie Cordier, ODI, whose preparatory work and support on the day ensured that the workshop went smoothly and that a full record of workshop proceedings was retained. Thanks also to Pippa Leask for preparing the document for publication and to Jackie Hussein for her proof reading of the text.

This workshop was, like the FBI, a collaborative endeavour that only succeeded as a result of the co-operation of all parties. The workshop constituted a special gathering of anglophone and francophone policy makers, rural development specialists and practitioners to discuss substantive issues arising from research on rural development. We are thankful to all those who made this possible and hope this record of proceedings capitalises on the results of the various programmes, provides concrete policy lessons and provides practical ideas for further collaboration.

Karim Hussein (Research Fellow, ODI) and Denis Pesche (Executive Secretary, IR)

¹ Now posted as a DFID representative at the World Bank in Washington.

Acronyms

ADE	Aide à la Décision Economique
ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa
ASSC	UK DFID's Advisory and Support Services Contract
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CDF	Comprehensive Development Framework
CILSS	Comité Permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte contre la Sécheresse au Sahel
Cirad	Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement
Cirad-Tera	Cirad's Département Territoires, Environnement et Acteurs (now known as: Département Agricultures Familiales)
CIRES	Centre Ivoirien du Recherche Economique et Sociale
CPR	Common Pool Resources
CNCR	Conseil National de Concertation et de Cooperation Rurale
CORAF (WECARD)	Conseil Ouest et Centre Africain pour la Recherche et le Développement Agricoles (West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development)
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
DGDEV	Directorate General – Development, EC
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
FBI	Franco-British Initiative
FCFA	Franc CFA
GATT	General Agreement on Tariff and Trade
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GRET	Groupe de Recherche et d'Echanges Technologiques
IFAP	International Federation of Agricultural Producers
IIED	International Institute for Environment & Development
INERA	Institut de l'Environnement et des Recherches Agricoles (Burkina Faso)
IR	Inter-Réseaux
IRD	Institut de Recherche pour le Développement
JFM	Joint Forest Management
MAE	Ministère des Affaires Etrangères (MAE), French Government
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NRIL	Natural Resources International Ltd
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

OPM	Oxford Policy Management Ltd
PADLOS	Projet d'Appui au Développement Local au Sahel
PRASET	Programme Régional d'Appui au Secteur d'Elevage Transhumant
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RDPSF	Rural Development Profile and Strategic Framework
REPA	Réseau d'Expertise sur les Politiques Agricoles
RPEG	Rural Policy and Environment Group
WAPN	West African Policy Network

Synthèse Française de l'Atelier

Le contexte de l'Initiative franco-britannique

Conformément aux conclusions du sommet Franco-britannique de 1995, qui appelait à une coopération plus étroite entre les pays anglophones et francophones de l'Afrique de l'Ouest, trois programmes conjoints franco-britannique concernant le développement rural ont été mis en œuvre. Ils ont eu pour objectif, sur trois thèmes stratégiques, d'améliorer les connaissances, les approches et de partager les leçons et les expériences entre des acteurs et des chercheurs du développement francophones et anglophones en Afrique de l'Ouest.

Ces programmes ont été conjointement financés par les gouvernements français et britanniques et ils ont donné lieu à des collaborations entre partenaires français, britanniques et ouest africains. Ils ont débuté en 1996, chacun avec un programme de partenariat spécifique avec des chercheurs africains, des institutions associées et une large gamme d'acteurs. L'un de ces programmes a aussi bénéficié des financements d'une association partenaire ouest africaine et de la Commission Européenne – CE (l'initiative CORAF).

Ces trois programmes ont abordé des thèmes comportant de forts enjeux régionaux tant macro-économiques que politiques et institutionnels. Il s'agit des thèmes suivants :

- Les relations entre la recherche agronomique, la vulgarisation agricole et les organisations de producteurs (l'initiative CORAF).
- Les questions foncières et l'accès aux ressources naturelles.
- Les politiques du secteur Cacao en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre.

Tous ces programmes ont développé des collaborations avec différents acteurs et ont donné lieu à l'organisation d'ateliers nationaux et régionaux, assurant ainsi une bonne diffusion des résultats et fournissant de nombreuses pistes de travail pour le futur.

Ils ont en commun d'avoir abordé des thèmes d'intérêt central pour l'actuelle politique européenne de développement rural et tentent, chacun dans leurs domaines, de répondre à la question suivante :

Comment améliorer les interactions entre Etats, marchés et acteurs du développement rural afin d'aider les populations rurales à avoir un accès plus facile et un meilleur contrôle de leurs ressources ?

Ces programmes ont tenté, pour chaque domaine thématique, de :

- Comprendre les nouvelles formes du développement dans le monde rural Ouest Africain, à travers les études réalisées par des équipes de chercheurs et praticiens du développement Ouest Africains, Français et Britanniques.
- Identifier et analyser les nouvelles tendances à prendre en compte dans la formulation des politiques d'aide au développement.
- Améliorer les capacités des partenaires Ouest Africains.
- Rapprocher les conceptions des acteurs et chercheurs français et britanniques sur les stratégies de développement rural par un échange permanent sur les méthodes de travail et les résultats.

Les objectifs de l'atelier

La coopération britannique (DFID) et le Ministère français des affaires étrangères (MAE) ont soutenu l'organisation d'un atelier de deux jours qui s'est tenu à ODI en septembre 2000, pour débattre de ces trois programmes. L'atelier était conjointement organisé par ODI (Londres) et Inter-Réseaux (Paris). Il a rassemblé des chercheurs britanniques, français et africains impliqués dans les programmes de collaboration, ainsi qu'un petit nombre de décideurs des politiques de développement des gouvernements français et britannique. Il a aussi associé quelques personnes impliquées dans d'autres initiatives proches, ainsi que celles travaillant sur la politique de développement rural de l'Union Européenne.

L'objectif général de l'atelier était de faire le bilan des résultats de ces programmes conjoints en vue de contribuer à l'amélioration des politiques de coopération en Afrique de l'Ouest. Les objectifs spécifiques de l'atelier étaient de partager des résultats, les productions de ces programmes de collaborations et d'élaborer une critique constructive des processus de collaboration pour en tirer des conclusions afin d'alimenter l'élaboration des politiques de développement rural de l'UE, du Royaume-Uni et de la France.

Résumé des principaux résultats des programmes conjoints

Points clefs de chaque programme

Les trois programmes de collaboration ont fourni d'importantes leçons, et ceci à plusieurs niveaux. Ils ont contribué à augmenter la connaissance et la compréhension des processus en cours, aux niveaux micro et méso, sur le foncier et l'accès aux ressources naturelles, sur les relations entre recherche, vulgarisation agricole et organisations paysannes et sur les politiques du secteur cacao en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre.

Résultats du point de vue de la méthode

Ces trois programmes ont donné l'occasion de nombreuses collaborations entre acteurs de différentes institutions et de différents pays. L'analyse de ces processus de collaboration permet de dégager quatre résultats principaux du point de vue de la méthode.

a) Enseignements du processus de collaboration

La collaboration Franco-Britannique a mis en évidence les difficultés spécifiques et les limitations liées au caractère bilingue des équipes de travail, réunissant de surcroît des spécialistes de cultures professionnelles très diverses. Ces aspects augmentent de manière significative les coûts de collaboration. Malgré ces contraintes, les trois programmes de collaboration ont permis de dégager des résultats très positifs, dans au moins deux domaines :

- Les contraintes de la traduction ont fourni de nombreuses occasions de débattre de façon détaillée des concepts et des méthodes utilisées dans le monde francophone et anglophone. Cela a permis de préciser les visions du développement rural, de rendre possible des débats fructueux et de construire les fondements d'analyses partagées qui peuvent utilement être mobilisés sur d'autres thèmes relatifs aux politiques de développement rural en Afrique sub-saharienne.
- La comparaison des processus de changement entre pays anglophones et francophones est riche d'enseignements sur les questions clefs concernant les politiques de coopération en

Les relations entre la recherche, la vulgarisation agricole et les organisations de producteurs

Ce programme a mis en évidence :

- Le fait que les organisations paysannes jouent un rôle croissant dans la défense des intérêts de leur membres lorsqu'elles sont fédérées à un niveau plus haut que celui du village (régional, national, ...). Ce rôle peut devenir très important lorsque ces organisations de producteurs sont reconnues formellement par leur gouvernement, lorsqu'elles sont fondées sur une libre association et lorsqu'elles sont articulées autour d'organisations traditionnelles fortes ou basées sur un secteur de production agricole.
- L'importance de prendre en compte les contextes politique, législatif, institutionnel et macro-économique dans le développement de liens entre la recherche agronomique, la vulgarisation agricole et les organisations paysannes.
- La nécessité de développer des mécanismes d'incitation au sein des institutions de recherche agronomique pour mieux orienter leurs activités vers la résolution de problèmes proposés par les producteurs, à travers :
 - la poursuite des politiques de décentralisation des instituts nationaux de recherche agronomique ;
 - des politiques de gestion des ressources humaines incluant des éléments matériels de motivation afin de stimuler un engagement participatif de la recherche et des modes de collaboration et de dialogue effectifs avec les organisations paysannes et les groupements agricoles ;
 - la création de cadres de négociation et de concertation incluant des représentants des organisations paysannes et pas seulement des agriculteurs isolés.
- Le besoin de renforcer les capacités techniques et stratégiques des organisations paysannes afin de leur permettre de formuler effectivement des demandes à leurs partenaires (recherche et vulgarisation agricole).

Le foncier et l'accès aux ressources en Afrique de l'Ouest

Ce programme a permis de développer une analyse approfondie des « droits dérivés » d'accès à la terre, aux ressources naturelles et de l'articulation entre usages locaux et structures gouvernementales locales ou nationales. Il souligne la diversité des contextes locaux et les difficultés d'établir des politiques foncières au niveau national. Ce programme a aussi élaboré un cadre d'analyse global pour mieux comprendre la diversité des situations locales et identifier des tendances communes dans les différents pays étudiés.

Ces tendances peuvent être rapidement résumées. Elles concernent : (1) un accroissement du rôle des « nouveaux paysans », provenant de zones urbaines et investissant dans l'activité agricole un capital acquis en dehors de l'agriculture ; (2) les processus de concentration de l'usage des terres et la différenciation sociale croissante dans les zones à fort potentiel économique ; (3) l'importance des « droits dérivés » en particulier pour les femmes et d'autres catégories de population « dominées » (les jeunes et les populations migrantes).

Politique du secteur cacao

Ce programme a mis en évidence la nécessité de suivre de près les changements rapides liés aux processus de libéralisation de la filière cacao. Il a constaté la faiblesse de la recherche agronomique concernant la compréhension des processus de changement économiques et institutionnels dans le secteur du cacao. Il est nécessaire à l'avenir d'impliquer, dans une optique de compréhension des processus et de définition des politiques, des représentants des gouvernements, des organisations de producteurs et du secteur privé qui jouent un rôle majeur dans le secteur cacao. Etablir des réseaux pour suivre ces processus et participer à l'élaboration de politiques sectorielles implique cependant des coûts élevés et nécessitent des engagements dans la durée de la part des acteurs clefs.

milieu rural, en particulier sur la décentralisation et la définition des rôles respectifs de l'état, du secteur privé et de la société civile dans le développement rural.

b) La pertinence d'une approche régionale

Malgré la diversité des situations nationales étudiées, le choix de privilégier un cadre d'analyse régional dans chacun des programmes a permis, en croisant les analyses nationales, d'identifier des thèmes transversaux et des questions communes aux différents pays. Ces éléments identifiés par les trois programmes peuvent fournir des bases utiles pour de futures politiques de développement rural. Plus généralement, une meilleure compréhension des principaux changements en cours dans les domaines considérés (foncier, la libéralisation des filières, orientation par la demande de la recherche agronomique et de la vulgarisation agricole), permet aux différents acteurs et partenaires africains de renforcer leurs capacités de définition et de mise en œuvre des politiques. Cela leur permet une meilleure prise en compte des contextes nationaux au regard de l'expérience des autres pays africains, facilitant en cela l'identification des moyens par lesquels ils peuvent améliorer leurs institutions et leurs activités.

c) Mieux articuler les niveaux micro, méso et macro

Les trois programmes se sont plus attachés à l'analyse des niveaux micro et méso. Par la richesse de l'analyse des processus locaux et des évolutions institutionnelles, ils apportent néanmoins d'utiles éléments pour l'élaboration des politiques au niveau national et régional. En particulier, ils mettent bien en évidence l'importance de prendre en compte la diversité des situations locales au moment de formuler des politiques globales dans les secteurs de l'agriculture et du développement rural.

d) Les résultats de la collaboration

Ces programmes témoignent de l'importance d'appuis pluridisciplinaires sur le long terme comme facteur clef pour renforcer les capacités des institutions de recherche africaines et des praticiens locaux du développement. Malgré des difficultés liées parfois à des formes de partenariat trop formalisées, ces programmes ont permis d'identifier les réseaux de partenaires africains compétents pouvant contribuer à améliorer les capacités des pays africains à définir leurs propres politiques de développement rural. Cette construction de « capital social », issue d'un contact régulier entre européen et partenaires africains, a permis d'accroître la confiance mutuelle. Quoique l'impact direct de ces programmes soit parfois difficile à estimer, ce tissu de relation et de compétences peut jouer un rôle important dans les années à venir, en particulier s'il est mis au service d'autres initiatives concernant les politiques de développement rural en Afrique de l'Ouest.

Identification de thèmes pour de futures actions

Pour une approche régionale des questions de développement rural

- L'importance d'avoir des échanges internationaux dans des domaines d'intérêts communs n'est plus à démontrer, en particulier sur des thèmes concernant l'ensemble ou une partie des pays africains (ex : questions foncières, évolution de l'élevage pastoral, gestion commune des ressources, effets de la libéralisation et des processus de décentralisation sur les moyens d'existence et les institutions locales, effets des ajustements structurels).
- Les sujets pour lesquels l'approche régionale est particulièrement utile sont nombreux. On peut rapidement lister, sans prétendre à l'exhaustivité : la terre et l'accès aux ressources naturelles, les « ressources collectives » partagées (ex : biodiversité), la libéralisation des filières (ex : cacao), les questions transfrontalières (ex : l'immigration).

L'approche processus : pragmatisme, concertation et formulation des politiques

- Il y a un besoin d'améliorer la compréhension des processus d'élaboration des politiques de développement rural en facilitant l'implication des différents acteurs (société civile, secteur privé) dans ces processus dans une logique d'apprentissage. Les processus d'élaboration et de mise en œuvre des politiques de développement nécessitent des mécanismes de suivi prenant en compte les changements liés au contexte global dans lequel elles s'inscrivent.
- Etant donné la complexité des questions traitées et des structures institutionnelles considérées, une approche pragmatique est de rigueur. Il faut définir des objectifs réalistes et spécifiques, dans le cadre d'un agenda précis pour déterminer le contenu et les modalités des interventions dans le domaine du développement rural. Ceci est à relier la prise de conscience croissante de la nécessité d'adopter des approches concertées pour mettre en œuvre des interventions réussies.
- Le succès d'une politique dépend en partie du degré réel d'implication des différents acteurs concernés. Les trois questions centrales sont donc : Comment identifier les acteurs pertinents en jeu ? Qui sont les populations cibles ou le public réellement concerné ? Jusqu'à quel point les gouvernements sont-ils prêts à enclencher des débats publics sur les objectifs des politiques nationales ?

Les responsabilités des agences d'aides

- Il est maintenant reconnu qu'une meilleure co-ordination entre les agences d'aide dans la mise en œuvre de leurs actions est importante. Ceci est plus particulièrement nécessaire entre les Etats membres de l'UE dans la perspective des cadres globaux de développement (*Comprehensive Development Framework*) qui se mettent en place au niveau des pays pour faciliter la collaboration entre agences d'aides. Une telle co-ordination est nécessaire pour éviter les incohérences et les conflits entre les politiques et les interventions.
- Les donateurs doivent trouver un subtil équilibre entre le travail avec les gouvernements nationaux et le travail avec la société civile – spécialement lorsqu'un débat public national se développe avec des liens aux niveaux local et régional.

Renforcer les capacités pour l'élaboration des politiques des pays africains partenaires

- Les priorités des politiques de développement rural doivent intégrer l'objectif de renforcement des capacités institutionnelles en vue d'améliorer le dialogue sur les politiques nationales et, pour ce faire, prévoir des moyens pour un accompagnement de long terme des processus de négociation entre les acteurs des différents niveaux, dans les pays africains.
- Il est important d'identifier les modalités qui permettront de renforcer les capacités des différents acteurs (Etats membres de l'UE, les organisations internationales, les départements des gouvernements nationaux qui traitent de développement rural et d'agriculture, les autres institutions, les ONG nationales et internationales, les organisations locales de développement et leurs acteurs) de façon à contribuer à la formulation des politiques de développement rural entre les partenaires des pays en voie de développement.
- Une étude complémentaire pourrait analyser les processus et les résultats des cas connus où des politiques agricoles ont été négociées entre l'Etat et les organisations paysannes (ex : le CNCR et PASOP au Sénégal ; le contrat-plan pour la filière coton au Mali ; la consultation nationale sur la politique agricole en Gambie). Cela pourrait permettre de développer une méthodologie qui exposerait les facteurs nécessaires et les bonnes pratiques pour développer une agriculture nationale et des politiques de développement rural.

Les capacités à construire les organisations locales

Les organisations paysannes ont besoin d'appuis pour développer leurs capacités stratégiques à prendre des décisions et influencer sur les politiques à travers des engagements effectifs dans le processus de dialogue nationaux (ex : les consultations avec la société civile autour des *Papiers de Réduction Stratégique de la Pauvreté* – PRSP). Néanmoins on doit se souvenir combien les gouvernements sont parfois hésitants dans leur volonté de promouvoir un tel dialogue. Pour les agences d'aide, le soutien aux processus de concertation nationaux (PRSP, cadres globaux de développement) et la possibilité d'associer à ce travail la diversité des acteurs locaux (universitaires, organisations de la société civile, ONG, etc.) peut rendre ces processus plus lourds à gérer.

Partager et diffuser les résultats

- Les modes de diffusion des résultats de ces programmes doivent être améliorés, en particulier à l'attention des décideurs et des autres acteurs locaux. Il y a un besoin croissant de trouver de nouvelles modalités de diffusion des résultats des programmes de collaboration et des initiatives politiques aux niveaux régionaux et locaux et ceci sous une forme accessible aux usagers locaux (modules de formation, intégration dans les processus de renforcement des capacités des organisations paysannes, ...). Il y a aussi besoin d'établir des modalités par lesquelles ces résultats pourraient nourrir les discussions au sein de la CE et être partagés entre les Etats membres et d'autres acteurs européens (ONG,...).
- Concrètement, les résultats des programmes conjoints de l'initiative franco-britannique pourraient aussi être présentés et discutés de manière approfondie avec les acteurs clefs dans les six pays étudiés (ex : organisations paysannes, ONG, fournisseur de services agricoles et autres organes gouvernementaux nationaux et régionaux, ainsi que le secteur privé). Ces rencontres pourraient être utiles pour identifier le contenu de formations et des mécanismes de diffusion de l'information en vue de renforcer les capacités locales.

Pourquoi cette expérience est-elle importante pour la CE ?

Les trois programmes analysés lors de cet atelier, et la richesse des résultats qu'ils ont fourni sur les institutions locales et leurs pratiques, peuvent apporter des éléments utiles à la CE, dans le cadre de la formulation des politiques de développement rural. Ceci d'autant plus lorsqu'il s'agit de définir des politiques à partir d'une compréhension des rapports entre les politiques nationales, les contextes régionaux / locaux, la diversité des groupes du monde rural, leurs atouts et les voies par lesquelles les pauvres en milieu rural peuvent consolider leurs moyens d'existence. La CE a une expérience plus pratique dans la formulation de stratégie et la réalisation de programmes de développement, en collaboration avec des partenaires nationaux. Par contre, des observateurs estiment que jusqu'à maintenant, elle a moins bien réussi dans la manière de relier les expériences pratiques, les analyses du niveau micro avec les processus de formulation de stratégies globales pour le développement rural.

En définitive, les programmes de l'initiative franco-britannique permettent de dégager les enseignements suivants :

- Ils soulignent l'importance de relier les données du niveau micro avec les politiques au niveau macro et les stratégies de développement : la CE gagnerait à développer des mécanismes de collecte et de synthèse des résultats et des connaissances que les différentes initiatives de développement peuvent apporter à travers les Etats membres pour les relier directement à sa stratégie de planification de ses interventions.
- Ils apportent des éléments sur la manière de conforter les populations rurales dans leur accès à différentes ressources et ceci dans différents contextes.
- Ils apportent des propositions pour des cadres d'analyse pluridisciplinaires valides au-delà des habituelles limites linguistiques, nationales et scientifiques.
- Ils démontrent comment des initiatives de collaborations bilatérales sur le développement rural peuvent fournir des résultats utiles permettant d'alimenter la formulation des politiques de la CE. La CE pourrait encourager et soutenir de telles collaborations entre Etats membres et renforcer les processus par lesquels ces travaux pourraient informer les prises de décision de la CE, en particulier dans la sélection des activités qui vont se développer suite aux récents accords de Cotonou.

La CE a des capacités limitées d'accroître sa propre collecte de données sur le milieu rural dans le grand nombre de pays où elle est engagée dans des programmes d'aide au développement rural. La CE pourrait utilement mobiliser les connaissances accumulées par les programmes de l'initiative franco-britannique mais aussi par d'autres initiatives (tels les travaux de l'IIED sur les organisations pastorales et du GRET sur la pauvreté et les inégalités) afin d'enrichir les processus d'élaboration des politiques de coopération. Cela permettrait de mieux prendre en compte les enseignements tirés de l'analyse des organisations locales, des institutions, des droits et des ressources mais aussi de faire vivre le principe de subsidiarité, faisant progressivement passer la responsabilité des décisions aux institutions les plus proches du terrain.

Quelles étapes suivantes pour la CE ?

Afin de mieux contribuer à l'élaboration des politiques de développement rural de la CE, les différents acteurs impliqués dans les programmes évoqués pourraient apporter leurs contributions sur les résultats, les enseignements et les perspectives issues de ces travaux ou de futures études. Ces contributions pourraient permettre de :

- Diffuser plus largement et de manière plus détaillée les résultats des programmes réalisés dans le cadre de l'initiative franco-britannique afin de faire de la DG Développement de la CE le lieu clé d'une réflexion innovante et d'analyses sur les politiques de développement à l'attention du monde rural.
- Publier les travaux finalisés des différents programmes sur le site *Rurpol* (www.rurpol.org), en faisant des liens avec les thèmes clés et les principaux documents de la politique européenne de développement rural.
- Faire participer chaque année un groupe de personnes impliquées dans les différentes initiatives nationales ou bilatérales aux discussions envisagées dans le cadre d'un forum européen sur la coopération au développement rural.
- Mobiliser des fonds régionaux européens pour soutenir de futures collaborations dans le domaine du développement rural en Afrique de l'Ouest en s'appuyant sur les initiatives déjà réalisées par certains Etats membres.

English Workshop Summary

Background to the Franco-British Initiative (FBI)

Following the Franco-British summit in 1995, which called for closer co-operation between anglophone and francophone countries in West Africa, three jointly funded policy-oriented rural development initiatives were developed with a view to sharing knowledge, approaches, lessons and experiences between francophone and anglophone development specialists in West and Central Africa. The EC and CORAF/WECARD, the West and Central Africa agricultural research organisation, also contributed funds to one of the programmes.²

The three programmes concentrated on themes of central importance to the region in the context of significant macro-economic, political and institutional changes in the 1990s:

- research – extension – farmers' organisation linkages (the 'CORAF Initiative');
- land tenure and derived rights of access to natural resources; and
- West and Central African cocoa policy.

Each programme involved:

- collaboration between French, UK and West African partners;
- significant degrees of stakeholder consultation at regional, national, and local level;
- regional, national and local workshops for consultation and dissemination of results; and
- the establishment of a variety of dissemination pathways for lessons learnt.

They also had in common a key issue of central interest to current rural development policy:

How best can interaction between state, policy makers and rural development actors be facilitated so that rural people gain increased access to, and control over, resources?

Workshop objectives

UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the French Ministère des Affaires Étrangères (MAE) sponsored this 2-day workshop co-organised by Inter-Réseaux (IR), Paris, and the Overseas Development Institute (ODI), London, held at ODI in September 2000. It brought together the French, British and West and Central African researchers involved in the collaborative programmes, UK and French government rural development officials; and a number of specialists involved in other relevant initiatives.

Overall, the workshop aimed to capitalise on the products of the collaborative process and contribute to the improvement of rural development co-operation policy. The specific objectives of the workshop were to share the results and outputs of these collaborative

² The EC contributed funds to hold a consultative workshop with CORAF/WECARD in Dakar in January 1999 to discuss the draft reports generated by the FBI-funded 6-country research programme dubbed the CORAF Initiative. This examined case studies of linkages between agricultural research organisations, extension and farmers' organisations for improved technology generation and dissemination. CORAF co-funded the initiative – providing one researcher to the team and also co-funding the Dakar workshop cited above. See Section A, Session 1, Study 3, page 40 for more details.

programmes, elaborate a constructive criticism of the process of collaboration, and draw lessons to inform current rural development policy in West Africa (particularly those of the EC, UK and France). The workshop also discussed which specific issues were common priorities to French, British and EC approaches to rural development and fitted with priorities of West African partners.

Main conclusions from the Franco-British Initiative programmes

Key points arising from each programme

The results of the three collaborative programmes are summarised in the three following boxes.

Land tenure and resource access in West Africa

This study developed an increased understanding of derived (e.g. secondary rights of access to natural resources, such as share cropping) rights of access to land and natural resources and of processes by which customary and local government structures interact. It emphasised the importance of taking into account the diversity of local contexts and the difficulties in establishing relevant and effective policies on tenure at the national or macro level. The study developed an analytical framework that helped go beyond highlighting diversity to identifying the most significant trends common to all the countries studied.

These trends include: in certain regions, the increased role in rural agriculture of 'new farmers' that move into rural areas from urban areas and invest capital drawn from outside agriculture into agriculture; processes of concentration and consolidation of land holdings; notable social differentiation (inequalities) in economically dynamic areas; the importance of derived rights for women and other categories of people suffering from subjugation or inequality: e.g. young and non-indigenous people. This is particularly important in defining who has access to productive land.

West and Central African Cocoa Policy Research and Analysis Networking

Agricultural research has very poor understanding of the economic and institutional dynamics of change in the cocoa sub-sector. This programme pointed to the need to monitor the rapid changes linked to the process of economic liberalisation occurring in this sub-sector, and to take into account the regional nature of the cocoa sub-sector in West and Central Africa. Lessons can be learned from the experiences of neighbouring countries. However, this should be done through a process that involves officials from government, farmers' organisations and private sector producers that play a major role in these developments and in cocoa production.

Building genuine partnership takes time and often requires efforts to build the capacities of partners and building a shared commitment involves learning and negotiating at all levels. Establishing regional policy networks involves high transaction costs and therefore will not succeed without adequate funding and commitment from the key actors.

Agricultural research, extension and farmers' organisation linkages for improved technology generation and dissemination

This study highlighted the following:

- the fact that farmers' organisations play an important role in defending their members interests, and are particularly effective where they are federated at a level higher than the village (regional; national...), accepted legally and formally by the government, are based on free association, have leaders that are accountable to members and represent their interests, arise out of strong traditional institutions or are based on around the production or processing of a commodity, or a profitable economic activity;
- the importance of a favourable political, legislative, institutional and macro-economic context to the existence of farmers' organisations and the promotion of strong linkages between these and public or private agricultural research and extension organisations;
- the need to more strongly encourage agricultural research institutions and researchers to direct their research towards solving development problems through: a continued policy of decentralising national agricultural research institutes; a human resources management policy and adequate material incentives for researchers to engage in participatory research/ formal and informal modes of collaboration and dialogue with farmers' organisations and farmer groups; establishment of negotiating fora and consultative frameworks which include farmers' organisation representatives and not solely successful, individual private farmers; and
- the need to strengthen farmers' organisations' technical capacities and resources so that they can formulate effective requests to agricultural service providers (this could be promoted, for example, through the establishment of funds dedicated to farmers' organisation proposals as part of agricultural service projects).

Lessons on collaboration, methods, approaches³

a) Lessons from the process of collaboration

Collaborative Franco-British approaches experienced specific difficulties that arose from working in multi-lingual teams, bringing together specialists from highly different academic disciplines and working cultures. This added significant transaction costs to the collaboration. Nonetheless, there were two very positive results in relation to the collaborative process itself:

- the need for translation provided opportunities for debate on francophone and anglophone concepts and methods, helped bring different visions of rural development closer and helped build the foundations upon which deeper analysis and more fruitful collaboration could be developed; and
- the comparison of processes of change in francophone and anglophone countries provided important lessons on processes of decentralisation and the appropriate roles of the State and non-state actors (private firms, farmers' organisations and civil society) in rural development.

³ A fuller summary of the results of each programme is presented in Section A, page 31.

b) Value of a regional approach

Despite the great diversity of contexts studied, the regional character⁴ of the approach taken to analysing rural development and policy in each of the programmes led, through the comparative analysis of country experiences, to the identification of a core set of cross-cutting themes and issues (see below). The programmes have a contribution to make to improved formulation of rural development policy in the following areas:

- identification of the key issues and trends in rural development in West and Central Africa; and
- strengthening the capacities of African decision makers, development actors and specialists through:
 - improved understanding of the major underlying trends in francophone and anglophone rural development theory, approaches, policies and strategies (e.g. in the areas of land tenure, liberalisation in export sub-sectors, improved accountability of and increasingly demand-led agricultural research and extension organisations);
 - development of tools, case studies and data that provide objective analysis of their national situations, helping to put their experiences in perspective set against the wider context of the experience of other (neighbouring) African countries; and
 - identifying practical ways to improve their institutions and activities.

c) Linking micro, meso and macro levels

Whilst the three programmes generally focused less on macro-level policy, they each yielded a wealth of new empirical case study data – particularly at the local, micro-level and intermediate or ‘meso’ level. In some cases, this data was drawn on to inform recommendations for national policy and approaches – hence contributing to bridging the micro-macro divide.⁵ The data and analysis made linkages between national policies and the strategies followed by local people and their village level institutions. Above all, the detailed empirical data on case study contexts highlighted the importance of taking into account the diversity of local situations and drawing on data on local institutions and contexts before formulating broad-brush rural development policy agendas.

d) Results of collaboration

These collaborative programmes showed that long term multidisciplinary technical support and partnership with northern institutions is a key factor in strengthening the capacities of African research institutions and development practitioners. Despite the difficulties encountered when processes of partnership were over-institutionalised or too formalised, the programmes

⁴ West and Central Africa are sometimes referred to elsewhere as a ‘sub-region’ of countries with specific similarities or linkages (e.g. in trade, migration patterns etc.), with Africa as a whole seen by some to be the wider ‘region’. However, perceptions of regions and sub-regions vary among development actors. To avoid confusion, for simplicity this report uses ‘regional’ throughout, referring to an approach that focuses on a number of countries in the same geographical area as distinct from bilateral approaches that focus on single countries. In this report, the region referred to is usually West Africa.

⁵ For example, policy recommendations on creating an enabling context in which more effective and widespread partnerships with farmers’ organisations can be developed, or recommendations on the care required in attempts to develop national, broad-brush tenure policies in the face of customary institutions and local diversity (see studies of Research-Extension-Farmers’ organisation linkages and land tenure/derived rights in Section A, Session 1, page 32).

helped to identify skilled and able African partners and resource persons. This has made a direct contribution to improving the capacity of African professionals to define and articulate their countries' rural development policy priorities. The creation and strengthening of social or professional capital through regular contact between European and African partners has resulted in increased trust and confidence in the partnerships, and the development of new collaborative ventures. While the impacts of the FBI programmes remain somewhat intangible at present, their importance and significance will become more apparent over years to come – evidenced in continuing and new collaborative initiatives on rural development in West Africa.

Summary of themes emerging from discussions and pointers for future action

Advantages of a regional approach to rural development issues

- It is relevant and important to have regional exchanges on areas of common interest to donors and West African partners. Areas where such approaches hold most promise include: sharing information and experiences of successful policy development and implementation (for example concerning land tenure, mobility of pastoral livestock, common property resources, the effects of liberalisation and decentralisation processes on livelihoods and local institutions, participatory approaches to development and capacity building, and coping with structural adjustment). Similar challenges are faced in a number of different countries in West and Central Africa, and substantial benefits have already been drawn from existing regional initiatives.
- Issues for which regional approaches appear particularly useful include: land and natural resource access, shared 'collective resources' (e.g. plant genetic material), liberalisation of sub-sectors (e.g. cocoa), transborder issues (e.g. migration) and sharing policy expertise (cf. the Réseau d'Expertise sur les Politiques Agricoles (REPA) initiative on sharing expertise in agricultural policy).

Process issues: pragmatism, consultation and policy formulation

- Greater emphasis on understanding policy processes and processes of stakeholder interaction and learning is required. The processes of policy development, implementation and change need to be closely monitored and adapted in the face of changes in the wider context.
- Given the complexities of the issues and institutional structures involved, a pragmatic approach is key: starting out by setting modest goals and developing a limited agenda, and then building effective rural development interventions upon this. This fits well with the increasing recognition of the need to adopt consultative, 'process' approaches to developing successful rural development interventions.
- Successful policies depend on the extent to which the policy development process is claimed and owned by primary stakeholders. Three key questions here are:
 - how can the relevant players and stakeholders be identified?
 - who are the target populations or relevant 'public'?
 - to what extent are governments likely to accept public debate on national policy objectives?

Donor responsibilities

- Greater co-ordination and coherence among donor policies, strategies and interventions and co-ordination of the budgets managed by each donor is required. This is particularly important among EC member states, and in the context of comprehensive development frameworks being established between groups of donors.
- Donors must strike a careful balance between working with national governments and working directly with civil society, noting the fact that debates on public policy in any country must take place at the national level, albeit informed by local level discussions.

Building capacities for policy formulation in African partner countries

- Priorities for policy initiatives must include building institutional capacity for enhanced policy dialogue at the national level and long term support for the process of negotiation between actors at all levels in African partner countries.
- Further ways to strengthen the capacities of different collaborators (EC member states, international organisations, national government departments concerned with rural development and agriculture, other national institutions, international and national NGOs, local development organisations and actors) to contribute constructively to rural development policy formulation in partner developing countries need to be identified.
- Further comparative analysis of process, results and outcomes in situations where agricultural policies have actually been negotiated between the State, farmers and farmers' organisations would be valuable (for example, with the national producer organisations such as Conseil National de Concertation et de Coopération Rurale (CNCR) and the organisation 'PASOP' in Senegal; the plan/contract for the cotton sub-sector in Mali; Comité Permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte contre la Sécheresse au Sahel (CILSS) and Club du Sahel-supported national consultation on agricultural policy in The Gambia). This could contribute to developing a methodology or approach that sets out key factors necessary (or best practice guidelines) for developing appropriate national agricultural / rural development policies.

Capacity building for local organisations

- Producer organisations and other civil society actors need assistance in developing their strategic decision-making capacities and ability to influence policy through more effective engagement in processes of national dialogue on development policies (e.g. Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) consultations with civil society). However, the extent to which national governments really wish to promote such dialogue is unclear, and donors may lose some flexibility to work with a range of actors in developing countries (academics, civil society organisations, NGOs etc.) if they sign up to the PRSP or Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) approaches.

Sharing and disseminating results

- If donor investments in rural development initiatives such as those presented here are to make a difference, the most effective modalities and mechanisms for dissemination of research findings to stakeholders and decision-makers need to be identified. Innovative ways of disseminating the results of collaborative programmes and policy initiatives at the international, regional, national and local levels are needed. Materials also need to be

produced in a format accessible to local rural users to truly build ownership of rural development interventions. The results of such initiatives could also be fed into EC rural policy discussions and shared among member states and other development actors through fora such as the new annual EC rural forum.

- Specifically, results of the programmes could be presented to, and discussed with, the key state and non-state actors concerned in the West and Central African countries where they were undertaken: for example farmers' organisations, CBOs, NGOs, agricultural service providers, national and local government bodies, and the commercial private sector. A series of meetings at each level in each country would be a first step to identifying a demand for, and the content of, training or dissemination activities that strengthen local capacities.

Relevance of these studies for EC, UK and French rural development policies

The three FBI programmes, and the rich data they provide on local institutions and practices, provide a number of lessons useful in the EC's rural development policy formulation process and to current UK and French debates on approaches to rural development. Contributions are concentrated in the following areas:

- **Helping the EC make the link between micro, meso and macro levels:** the EC has much practical experience in strategy formulation and in the implementation of rural development programmes in collaboration with partners, but it has been less successful in linking practical lessons from project experience and micro-level data with strategy formulation and macro-level policy initiatives. The EC would benefit from developing ways of collecting and summarising the results of different rural development initiatives being promoted by member states and connecting them directly to EC strategic planning processes.
- **Detailed case study data:** rich contextual data on the assets of rural people that are key to their livelihoods and the ways in which access to these should be supported and strengthened has been collated and analysed in relation to a number of specific West African contexts.
- **Collaborative processes and multidisciplinary analytical frameworks:** comments on the practicalities of undertaking collaborative processes have been synthesised to inform and improve future collaboration; ideas for developing multidisciplinary analytical frameworks that cross linguistic, cultural and scientific boundaries have been developed.
- **Importance of bilateral initiatives in informing the approaches of multilateral institutions:** the programmes provided examples of how spontaneous bilateral initiatives on rural development yield results that can usefully feed into rural development policy formulation in multilateral institutions.
- **Lessons on roles for the EC:** the EC can play a pivotal role in sharing information on collaborative initiatives, encouraging and supporting further collaboration among EU members and strengthening the processes by which they can feed into the EC's decision-making processes and selection of specific rural development interventions. This is especially relevant in the context of the Cotonou agreement replacing the Lomé Convention.

The EC has limited capacity to increase its own collection of micro-level data on diverse rural contexts. However, it can more proactively draw on the rich micro and meso-level data and analysis provided by member state initiatives such as the FBI and other bilateral programmes

to inform the development of more pertinent and appropriate rural development co-operation policies and frameworks. These would take into account the lessons from local organisations, institutions, rights and resources. They would also build on the principle of subsidiarity, passing responsibility for decisions to institutions at the lowest practical level.

In order for the programmes discussed at the workshop to add value and effectively inform EC, UK, and French rural development policies and interventions, as a minimum, the following activities could be undertaken:

- submit policy-oriented summaries for dissemination on the EC's rural policy website (www.rurpol.org), making links as appropriate with DFID sponsored websites e.g. (www.dfid.gov.uk, www.livelihoods.org), and the MAE e.g. (www.diplomatie.fr/cooperation);
- disseminate results widely in other international fora (conferences such as the World Bank/IFAP's Producer Organisation workshop in 1999; academic conferences; development-oriented websites...);
- present and discuss the results at the annual EC rural development forum; and
- while recognising that the EC may have the comparative advantage in providing regional funds for further collaborative initiatives on rural development in West and Central Africa, the results of and professional relationships established in the FBI could be capitalised upon by establishing further co-funded Franco-British programmes in collaboration with West African partners on specific rural development themes where the policy orientations each actor coincide.

Foreword

Two questions feature prominently on the development agenda at present, and this collaborative initiative has contributed answers to both. The first question is about substance: how can rural poverty be reduced? The second question is about process: what steps must donors and their Southern partners take, if they are to live up to their aspiration of working more coherently together?

The first question is not new, but remains urgent: some three-quarters of the 1.2 billion people living below \$US 1 per day live in rural areas, but aid to agriculture and rural development has fallen by two thirds. New thinking is needed to reinvigorate policy in this area.

The studies summarised here do not cover all possible issues in rural development, but they do shed light on important topics, all in the context of a regional focus on West Africa: the institutions and organisations of the rural sector (land tenure, farmer and pastoralist organisations), research and extension systems, and policy towards cash crops (in this case, cocoa). West Africa is changing fast, transformed over the past generation by population increase, urbanisation, migration towards the coast, liberalisation of the economic environment, and, in too many cases, civil conflict. National situations differ markedly between former French and British colonies. Nevertheless, there are common themes.

- First, a regional focus is unavoidable in West Africa, because of economic linkages and migration flows, but also because countries are producing similar crops for similar international markets. Thus, effective commodity policy (for example, for cocoa) cannot be made without an understanding of the regional character of cocoa production and trade flows.
- At the same time, and at a working level, regional collaboration remains full of pitfalls: as the cocoa case again illustrates, the transaction costs are high, and there are sometimes real conflicts of interest between countries competing for markets or market share. Genuine partnership at a regional level needs investment in trust-building and analytical capacity, and consensus building on policy.
- From both regional and national perspectives, rural development needs to be set in the wider context of poverty reduction. The current international consensus, as represented, for example, in the World Bank's World Development Report for 2000/1, emphasises a three-legged approach to poverty reduction, based on opportunity (or growth), empowerment, and security. Rural development policy will need to cover similar territory, for example on the empowerment of rural people, and on the responsiveness of the state to their needs.
- Here, the research shows that the participation of rural people in policy-making is greatly enhanced when it is rooted in an effective organisational reality. For example, farmers' organisations are shown to be effective in increasing the influence of their members, but only under certain conditions: when they are federated at a higher level than the village, given a formal role in policy-making, and with a membership bound together by a common interest in remunerative productive activities.
- This sounds plausible, but at the same time, the heterogeneity of the sector needs to be remembered when constructing national policies: 'farmers' are not a homogeneous group. For example, the research shows that rural people have different rights of access to resources,

and that rural producers undertake a range of agricultural and non-agricultural activities to generate livelihoods. The poor may be excluded, not only from representative institutions, but also from access to resources; legal reform in the 'modern' sector may make the situation worse, not better. Thus, the research on land tenure shows that many farmers, especially marginalised groups, can derive their access to land indirectly, and that local customary laws (which give poor people access) often conflict with new land laws based on market principles (which may not).

- Heterogeneity and local specificity imply the need for careful, local analysis of rural development problems and opportunities. The real challenge to rural development policy in West Africa, however, will be to make the connection between the local, the national and the regional. Regional and national analysis cannot be made in ignorance of local reality; by the same token, local priority setting needs to take regional and national factors into account.

This brings us to the need for team-working, and to the second question, about how to achieve policy coherence, at all levels, and involving all partners – especially given that a key feature of the FBI programmes was the principle of collaboration between French and UK institutions with West African partners to respond to West African development priorities. Here, the programmes provided some important lessons.

- First, as with the formation of cocoa policy, a key lesson is that building genuine partnership takes time and often requires efforts to build the capacities of partners. Different partners – whether from North or South – come to the table with different conceptual frameworks, ways of identifying problems, analytical methods, and policy prescriptions. Building a shared commitment involves learning and negotiating at each of these levels.
- From a research perspective, partnership needs to begin early, at the stage of research planning, where conceptual frameworks and analytical approaches will need careful discussion. Steering committees can be useful to provide direction and facilitate ongoing dialogue, with members drawn from each of the sponsors of a research programme.
- The experience reported here also suggests that research needs to have an institution-building component, which strengthens the technical, methodological and analytical capacities of West African partners. This will include strengthening the capacities of research, extension and farmers' organisations to work together.
- Finally, one of the lessons drawn is that the research process does not come to an end when the research results become available: for research to be well-used, a large investment is needed in dissemination and dialogue, with rural people and with policy-makers.

There are implications for donors in all of this, and the case studies provide ample support to the current enthusiasm for donor co-operation. France and Britain are important actors in development, individually, as EU partners, and as members of the wider international community. The Franco-British initiative has provided lessons for collaborative endeavours within the EU and a platform for further Franco-British-West African collaboration on areas of common interest in the future. Will that potential be realised?

Simon Maxwell, Director, Overseas Development Institute, January 2001

Introduction

The Franco-British Initiative (FBI)

Following the Franco-British summit in 1995, which called for closer co-operation between anglophone and francophone countries in West Africa, three policy-oriented rural development initiatives were developed with a view to sharing knowledge, approaches, experiences and lessons between francophone and anglophone development specialists in West Africa.

The three programmes were jointly funded by the French and British governments, and involved collaboration between French, British and West African partners in support of West African priorities. They were launched in 1996, each with a project memorandum drawn up in partnership with African researchers, institutional partners and a wide variety of stakeholders. One of the programmes also attracted funding from a regional West African partner organisation and a contribution from the EC (the CORAF Initiative).

The three programmes concentrated on themes of central importance to the region in the context of significant macro-economic, political and institutional changes in the 1990s:

- research – extension – farmers' organisation linkages;
- land tenure and derived rights of access to natural resources; and
- West and Central African cocoa policy.

These programmes had in common a key issue of central interest to contemporary rural development policy of European development agencies:

How best to promote and facilitate interaction between the state, policy makers, rural development actors and local communities so that rural people in West Africa gain increased access to and control over resources and hence improved livelihoods

The programmes were based upon a number of premises:

- recognition of the changing political climate in Africa, with increased pressures towards decentralisation and local level empowerment – including decision-making over the allocation of funds by government departments of agriculture;
- increasing pressures on the natural resource base in the region, requiring better focused policies;

The key issue:
How best to promote and facilitate interaction between the state, policy makers, rural development actors and local communities so that rural people in West Africa gain increased access to and control over resources and hence improved livelihoods.

- liberalisation and macro-economic reform leading to increased emphasis on agricultural marketing and processing, with the consequent increase in importance of non-state actors involved in these activities and increased importance of the clients of agricultural services (farmers' organisations, private sector, co-operatives...);
- increased emphasis on finding mechanisms to encourage agricultural services to become more demand-led as funds available to national extension and research services diminish;
- the declining contribution of agriculture and natural resources to GDP in the region, indicating stagnation and decline, in the context of the significant impact of policies such as devaluation of the Franc CFA (the regional currency of the West African francophone community of states directly linked to the value French franc) and the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) round on agriculture in the region. Designing the correct policy response and managing the necessary policy changes in this context is difficult and many countries are not well-equipped to do this; and
- differing colonial and post-colonial histories in anglophone and francophone West African countries provide a wide variety of experiences that can usefully be drawn upon to inform approaches to management of natural resources, common property resources and pastoral grazing systems.

Why hold a workshop?

The FBI represented a considerable investment of UK and French development assistance funds. A key underlying objective of the various programmes supported by the FBI was to work collaboratively with regional partners in support of priorities identified by them. Further, the FBI was a special professional collaboration between French, British and francophone and anglophone African rural development specialists, which developed valuable and in many cases lasting professional and institutional linkages. However, there had been few opportunities for the results of these programmes to be shared between all concerned and their contribution contemporary French, British, EC and West African rural development policy debates had yet to be explored. The collaborative initiatives could specifically inform the British and French governments in the context of wider EU and international co-operation on rural development policy.

Hence, following meetings at the Club du Sahel/Inter-Réseaux (IR) consultative workshops on aid policy reform in Paris (Spring 1999), and the World Bank workshop on mainstreaming partnerships with producer organisations (June 1999), several institutions involved in the FBI agreed on the usefulness of holding

a workshop that brought together French and British development specialists and policy makers to capitalise on programme outputs. A small number of UK and French specialists who had worked on relevant themes but in parallel initiatives not funded by the FBI were invited to bring external perspectives and broaden debate on lessons and future perspectives. The UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the French Ministère des Affaires Etrangères (MAE) agreed to jointly sponsor the workshop to be held at the Overseas Development Institute (ODI).

Workshop objectives and outputs

The overall objective of the workshop was to capitalise on the products of the FBI, drawing on lessons from three relevant non-FBI initiatives, with a view to contributing to the improvement of development co-operation policy on rural issues in West Africa. The workshop focused on the ways in which rural institutions and actors interact among themselves and with their broader environment to improve access to resources and livelihoods. This led to a reflection on the development policy measures required to encourage better synergies between macro-level policies (such as those on decentralisation, poverty reduction, participation and capacity building), rural institutions and diverse, micro-level, context-bound rural realities and livelihoods.

The overall objective of the workshop was to capitalise on the products of the FBI with a view to contributing to the improvement of development cooperation policy on rural issues in West Africa.

More specifically, the workshop aimed to:

- share the results and outputs of the collaborative FBI programmes;
- elaborate a constructive criticism of the process of collaboration (advantages, limitations and frustrations);
- discuss themes common to French, British and EC initiatives on rural development and that fit with key issues and priorities currently facing West Africa;
- inform current rural development policy; and
- discuss the potential for future collaborative initiatives.

Participating institutions (see Appendix 2, page 78, for list)

Four groups of participants were invited to the workshop:

- i. francophone and anglophone Europeans and West Africans directly involved in the collaborative projects (researchers who participated on behalf of ODI, CIRAD-Tera, OPM, GRET, IIED and CORAF⁶);

⁶ Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement (Cirad), Oxford Policy Management (OPM), Group de Recherche et d'Echanges Technologiques (GRET), International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), and Conseil Ouest et Centre Africain pour la Recherche et le Développement Agricoles (CORAF).

- ii. West African researchers who were directly involved in undertaking the collaborative projects;
- iii. a small number of rural development specialists working on related themes in the UK, France and Europe (from IR, Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD) and non-FBI initiatives managed by researchers from GRET, IIED and ADE);
- iv. representatives from the main funding partners (DFID and MAE).

Presentations

The presentations at the workshop included the following:

FBI programmes

- CIRAD/CORAF/ODI study of research-extension-farmers' organisation linkages in West and Central Africa (Pierre-Marie Bosc, CIRAD-Tera; Jean Zoundi, INERA (Institut de l'Environnement et des Recherches Agricoles in Burkina Faso); Karim Hussein, ODI)
- IIED/GRET work on land tenure issues rights of access to resources in West Africa (Camilla Toulmin, IIED; Jean-Pierre Chauveau, IRD)
- OPM/CIRAD on the West and Central African Cocoa Policy Research and Analysis Networking (Bruno Losch, CIRAD-Tera; Jim Gilling, OPM)

Parallel initiatives

- IIED work on strengthening pastoral organisations (Ced Hesse, IIED)
- IRD/GRET study of the consequences of household behaviour and social dynamics in a period of change on public policy and poverty (Marc Levy, GRET)
- EU Rural Development Policy and Strategic Framework (Luc Lefebvre, ADE)

Structure of this report

Section A of this report provides an overview of workshop proceedings, outputs presented and the process of collaboration. It identifies key themes emerging and pointers for future action.

Section B provides a synthesis of workshop conclusions and operational lessons arising, and proposes ways forward.

Section C includes Appendices listing programme outputs in detail, workshop participants and contact details, the workshop programme, and profiles of the organising institutions.

Section A: Overview of Workshop Proceedings

Introduction

The workshop was opened by the Simon Maxwell, Director of ODI, who welcomed participants. He went on to stress the importance of development agencies and donors working together to overcome the enormous challenges currently facing rural development. In particular, he highlighted the importance of collaboration among EC member states and hoped that such collaborative ventures as these might establish useful foundations for future initiatives. He noted that the intellectual and institutional challenges presented by the changing context of rural development are significant. Key changes and trends include:

- technical change, population increase, smaller farm size and greater degrees of landlessness;
- globalisation, changing trade regimes and general exposure of rural people to pressures of the international economy; and
- urbanisation: a likely urban majority by 2020 will exert increased demands on rural areas.

Mr Maxwell argued that rural development policies are needed to respond to these trends and to the increased vulnerability of the rural poor to external shocks. There is also a need to identify and support effective livelihood strategies, to encourage increased diversification of rural livelihoods, acknowledging the increased importance of non-farm activities in rural livelihoods. In short, a niche had to be found for the rural poor in a changing world.

There is a general consensus that poverty reduction is a central objective of development assistance, but this is accompanied by a concern that producers should be given increased voice in poverty reduction strategies.

It was noted that there is now a general consensus amongst donors that poverty reduction is a central objective of development assistance, but this is accompanied by a concern that producers should be given increased voice in poverty reduction strategies. The World Bank and EC are both currently engaged in devising new strategies for rural development. This workshop was therefore an important opportunity to influence the policy debate and 'capture' the emerging rural development policy agenda and move it forward.

Mr. Maxwell stressed the importance of European development agencies developing a common voice on development issues moving towards a more coherent European development strategy. He encouraged the extension of groups of 'like-minded' donors, building bridges between institutions, developing policy networks

and strengthening international links across the development community. Specifically, he argued that there is scope for forging a closer alliance between French and British specialists and working together to better address the challenges facing rural development.

The workshop hoped to encourage improved policy dialogue between diverse rural development actors.

The workshop organisers, Karim Hussein (ODI) and Denis Pesche (IR), then highlighted opportunities presented by the workshop as it brought together diverse actors involved at different levels of rural development policy, research and practice. The workshop hoped to encourage improved policy dialogue between these rural development actors.

Session 1: Process, Outputs and Results

Study 1: Land tenure and derived rights⁷ (Camilla Toulmin, IIED)

Overview

This programme, jointly managed by GRET and IIED, developed an in-depth understanding of the various arrangements by which people gain access to land and other resources, known as ‘derived rights’ or ‘droits dérivés’. These include such institutions as share-cropping, pledge and mortgage of land, tenancy, gift and loans. There are major changes taking place in these forms of arrangement as land becomes more valuable and new actors enter the land market, and the evolution of derived rights must be understood in the broader context of social, economic and political change.

The research developed understanding of the varied arrangements by which people gain access to land and other resources, particularly those known as ‘derived rights’ or ‘droits dérivés’. The need to address natural resource conflict was also highlighted.

The research programme has also examined the articulation between customary authority and a range of state structures, at local, meso and national levels. The research highlights the fact that the diversity of situations between localities and countries makes it difficult to design detailed land tenure provisions and policies at the national level. Rather, the results emphasise the central importance of establishing mechanisms for addressing conflict and resolving disputes over land and resources at the local level. Such mechanisms need to be seen to operate in a transparent, equitable and accountable manner if they are to acquire sufficient legitimacy amongst different stakeholders, to ensure their effectiveness.

Important trends identified in the West African region include:

- the increased role of ‘new farmers’, often from urban areas, who are investing capital in rural activities;

⁷ Copies of the full research summary distributed at the workshop are available from ODI and further related publications are referenced in Appendix 1 (p.73).

There are five important trends affecting rights to resources in West Africa.

- land concentration in economically dynamic areas;
- the importance of derived rights for more marginal social groups, such as women, younger men, and incoming migrants;
- widespread processes of decentralisation and establishment of elected local government; and
- and major impacts on neighbouring lands from rapid growth in urban areas.

Background

The issue of land tenure in West Africa is a critical one. Growing competition for increasingly scarce land resources emphasises the need for clear supportive mechanisms to help people assert claims to land. In most countries existing systems and institutions are limited and there is growing recognition of the need to decentralise structures and power. Several countries are currently involved in pilot programmes and many are also going through processes of decentralisation. This project has focused on the diversity of arrangements for land tenure in West Africa, how and why they are changing, and the impact these changes have had.

Aims and objectives

The objective of the project was:

To address more effectively the issues and policy options concerning land tenure and resource access, with the aim of capacity strengthening amongst key policy makers, research institutions, NGOs and other interest groups, opening up new and innovative approaches for sharing experience and information between and amongst English and French speaking Africans.

Activities and outputs

The first phase of work was mostly focused on a programme initiated by the French Ministère de la Coopération prior to the FBI, but it benefited from some UK contributions. Key outputs and activities from Phase I included:

- document on current thinking and experience on land issues in West Africa and a synthesis volume;
- lexicon of French-English terms on land tenure in West Africa;
- annotated bibliography of key texts on land tenure in Africa; and
- Workshop in Gorée, Senegal, bringing together 20 West African researchers and experts on land tenure issues to discuss and compare experiences.

Documents were published in French with advice and inputs from the UK IIED team. The workshop was co-organised by GRET and IIED and provided a forum for English and French speaking researchers and allowed wide-ranging discussions. Full proceedings

were published and disseminated in French and English in mid-1997.

The second phase of collaboration built on the first, but was a jointly designed research programme focusing on two major themes:

Theme A: Derived rights to land and natural resources

English and French speaking West African researchers were identified to carry out research on derived rights and natural resources in Ghana, Nigeria, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire and Senegal. A workshop was held in Accra to discuss research proposals, methods, tools for fieldwork, analysis of data and policy implications. Fieldwork was carried out at various sites on plantation agriculture, peri-urban agriculture, high value wetland areas in drylands, zones of new settlement and migration. An analytical workshop was held in Ouagadougou following the research to present and discuss findings and identify cross-cutting issues. Final reports will be published by the end of 2000.

Theme B: Articulation between customary and local government structures

A report has been drafted from a case study in Ghana on *State land administration and modes for land resource management at meso and local levels*.

On the UK side, five key outputs with policy significance were produced:⁸

- i Support for the preparation of *DFID/Ministère de la Coopération (now Ministère des Affaires Etrangères (MAE)) Land Policy Brief*;
- ii *Land tenure and Resource Access in West Africa and Opportunities for the next 25 years*;
- iii *Land tenure lexicon: A glossary of terms from English and French speaking West Africa*;
- iv Networking proposal on Land tenure issues in West Africa, for joint funding by DFID and MAE; and
- v Toulmin, C, Lavigne Delville, P and Traoré S, (eds.) forthcoming, *The Dynamics of Resource Tenure in West Africa*.

Problems surrounding language, varied definitions and intellectual frameworks presented a significant challenge to research teams, but also generated positive results.

Problems encountered

- Problems surrounding language, definitions and intellectual frameworks presented a significant challenge, but also had positive results. They tended to slow down the whole process of research, but the synergy of ideas and approaches was nevertheless very valuable. Translation of the land tenure lexicon from French to English proved complex and necessitated careful

⁸ See Appendix 1 (p. 73) for full list of outputs.

reflection on the francophone and anglophone perspectives and academic traditions, but also left a lasting resource for future work in the field.

- The interests and behaviour of French and British governments were at times different and the UK was less interested in funding research in francophone areas.
- It was difficult to identify adequate numbers of West African researchers with the required multi-disciplinary team research skills and experience.
- It proved much easier to build constructive links between British and French researchers than between anglophone and francophone West Africans. The latter takes time to build confidence and trust.
- Communications within francophone West Africa are relatively strong, but communications links between francophone and anglophone West African countries are weak.

Lessons learned and themes for future work

Key lessons included the need to:

- build closer collaboration between French, British and West African collaborators;
- find the appropriate balance between the contribution of different researchers and partner institutions;
- build partners' needs and interests into programmes from the beginning;
- engage more directly in policy debate; and
- establish a joint steering group including both funders (French and UK) for collaborative projects: their role can be key, particularly in defining a strategic research framework.

Important themes for future study include:

- ensuring more security of claims over land;
- legitimising local processes and institutions;
- promoting improved articulation between local, customary and state structures to encourage more constructive debate;
- the impact of decentralisation on land management; and
- the impact of market transactions, the commoditisation of land and associated changes in local institutions.

Summary of discussion

These collaborative programmes involved large numbers of people from different professional backgrounds. A key factor in the success of collaborative programmes is the degree of synergy between these. Here, the role of the joint steering committees is very important as they can provide direction and facilitate ongoing dialogue with the donors.

Joint steering committees involving representatives from each donor can provide policy direction and facilitate ongoing dialogue.

Rural development policy must take into account the dynamic and varied nature of rural conditions.

Rural development policy must take into account the dynamic nature of rural conditions, for example civil society changes continuously, rural populations are less local and more heterogeneous and stakeholders increasingly diversified. This dynamism has acquired new force, leading this research to emphasise: the diversity of local contexts; the implications of this diversity for developing relevant and effective national level policies; the need to move away from universal blueprints to policies tailored to specific circumstances; and, above all, the need to achieve consensus through more representative bodies which can address rival claims to resources more effectively.

The challenge of taking account of diversity and empowering local institutions is to balance devolution of authority with some sort of supervisory power.

Dealing with diversity by empowering local institutions is, however, somewhat problematic. Whilst the experience of developing centralised solutions to land tenure and resource access problems has been poor, it was also acknowledged that the risk of local elites taking over new structures is great. The challenge therefore, is to balance devolution of authority with some sort of supervisory power.

It was argued that land titling programmes led by central government often encourage key actors to take strategic actions in support of their interests that create more insecurity in tenure rather than reduce it. Key questions surround the difference between land security and equity. Although a number of technical measures have been devised to address this, these have often rapidly encountered problems. For example, in Côte d'Ivoire actors are developing anticipatory strategies in the face of proposed change. Further, there is a tendency to overlook the degree to which these issues are politicised at the local level. This is particularly problematic in relation to process of privatisation of customary law. Solutions to such problems extend beyond technical ones to adapting local government. A West African collaborator noted that no matter what kind of law is put in place, fundamental problems of conflicting customary laws and of commoditisation will continue to exist unless the broader problem of poverty is addressed. Poor people are increasingly forced to sell land which they cannot afford to cultivate and disparities between rich and poor continue to grow.

No matter what kind of law is put in place, fundamental problems of conflicting customary laws and of commoditisation will continue to exist unless the broader problem of poverty is addressed.

There is an important link between agricultural intensification and land tenure/ownership rights. Land tenure and resource access problems are subject to multiple overlapping factors and agro-economic explanations are over-simplistic. Indeed, agricultural productivity is a function of access rather than tenure – and degrees of access are much more difficult to ascertain.

Finally, programmes must be subject to continuous monitoring, and mechanisms to feed back lessons from experience into decision-

making processes need to be established. A key issue remaining is establishing the appropriate balance between regional, national and local or meso-level approaches to tackling these problems: is there a way to combine these approaches to that each adds value?

Study 2: West and Central African cocoa policy research and analysis networking⁹

(Bruno Losch, CIRAD-Tera and Jim Gilling, OPM)

Overview

This research programme set out to enhance knowledge and improve the policy-making process in the cocoa sub-sector in West and Central Africa. The programme remains unfinished having been halted midway through. However, a number of important results to date should be highlighted.

Agricultural research generally has a poor understanding of the economic and institutional dynamics of change in the cocoa sub-sector. There is a need to monitor the rapid changes linked to the process of economic liberalisation occurring in the cocoa sub-sector. This monitoring process should involve a range of actors, including representatives of government, farmers' organisations and private sector producers that play a major role in developing these policies and in cocoa production. This can be done through the establishment of policy networks. However, establishing policy networks involves high transaction costs and therefore cannot succeed without adequate funding and long term commitment.

There is a need to monitor the rapid changes occurring in the cocoa sub-sector linked to the process of economic liberalisation. This monitoring process should involve a range of actors.

Background

It has been difficult to establish effective holistic, multi-sectoral agricultural policy initiatives (e.g. West African Policy Network (REPA/WAPN) promoted by France with UK support in 1996). This programme therefore decided to focus on a single sub-sector: cocoa. The entry point was via a research network. The cocoa sub-sector was selected for a number of reasons:

- cocoa is of great social, political and economic importance in the sub-region;
- production of cocoa is still carried out predominantly by poor smallholders;
- cocoa is one of the principal sources of revenue for the rural poor;
- the continued spread of cocoa production into new areas has had significant economic and environmental impacts; and finally
- cocoa has been at the heart of the economic liberalisation debate

⁹ Copies of the full research summary distributed at the workshop are available from ODI and further publications from the organisations referenced in Appendix 1 (p. 73).

in West Africa and a major focus of policy debate between donors and partners.

Aims and objectives

Primary objectives included to:

- enhance local knowledge on the impact of liberalisation;
- improve training, policy and management in the cocoa sector;
- initiate a dialogue between researchers and decision-makers and between anglophone and francophone agencies; and
- identify themes and opportunities for investment in local policy research.

Additional objectives included to:

- strengthen regional and national capacity for policy research;
- identify African partners that had demonstrable competence for financial and technical support in the sector;
- help strengthen anglophone and francophone links; and
- improve the process of formulation and management of cocoa policy in the context of liberalisation and globalisation.

The programme was funded by DFID and MAE, managed and facilitated by CIRES (Centre Ivoirien du Recherche Economique et Sociale), a research organisation based in Côte d'Ivoire, and had a predominantly African steering committee. Technical support was provided by the University of Birmingham, OPM and CIRAD.

Activities and outputs

An initial workshop was held in February 1998 in Abidjan to engage regional universities and research institutions (from Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Togo, Nigeria and Cameroon). A region-wide call for papers was put out and a steering committee established to guide research in preparation for the main workshop. A regional workshop on liberalisation was then held in November 1998, which aimed to identify principal themes for further research. An extended list of outputs can be found in Section C, Appendix 1, page 76.

Problems encountered

The project encountered a number of practical problems, the most serious of which was the failure of the regional secretariat, eventually leading to the suspension of the programme. There was some confusion between the concepts of 'networks' and 'networking'. The fact that the group was composed mainly of researchers was also limiting, and a number of problems arose due to changes in the original team. Two other constraints were critical:

- lack of consistency between the strategies of different donors (especially in levels of financing and duration of support); and
- high transaction costs of working with regional assemblies and inter-agency working groups.

There were a number of technical difficulties associated with the research partners: quality of the majority of research papers tended to be given a lack of resources; knowledge of core policy issues and practical issues faced by growers tended to be weak; knowledge about stakeholders in the liberalisation process was limited; and analytical approaches were weak.

Lessons learned and themes for future work

Four key lessons for cocoa policy development were drawn:

- inter-government economic competition can be an obstacle to regional economic integration in certain sectors;
- there is a lack of awareness and analysis of the impact of liberalisation;
- the process of building development policies is a public good; and
- local ownership of the policy debate is needed for policies to be ultimately sustainable.

Local ownership of the policy debate is needed for policies to be sustainable.

In spite of the suspension of the programme in response to the problems cited above, the importance of cocoa policy indicates that further work is required. However, this should take account of the following lessons:

- it is imperative to include public, private and non-governmental agencies in the process of policy development; and
- strengthening the capacity of all key actors (including partners) for policy research and analysis is an important precondition for enhancing ownership of policies and therefore information and training-based programmes should be supported.

Strengthening capacity for policy analysis and formulation through networking is costly. It requires long-term engagement, adequate financing, flexible management and institutional support from donors.

An important operational conclusion is that strengthening capacity through establishing networking is costly. It requires long-term engagement, adequate financing, flexible management and institutional support from donors.

Summary of discussion

Many West African partner institutions have not yet fully taken on board current international policy and research debates (e.g. contemporary thinking on economic liberalisation, the roles of the private sector and civil society). Bridging the gap between the knowledge and practice of partner institutions and current international policy debates is therefore vital. In order for West African partners to be able to articulate their problems and engage in meaningful policy debate with potential donors, efforts need to be devoted to increasing their exposure to new information quickly and enhancing their capacity for critical analysis. However, government and partner participation in the liberalisation debate remains limited, and this can stifle ownership of policy responses. Hence, in order for this network to be successful, all stakeholders

need to be actively involved, an enlarged and active steering committee needs to be established to provide strategic advice to the network, and there needs to be a sustained financial commitment.

In a globalised economy, it is important that actors are aware of what other countries are doing in a sub-sector, as isolation undermines the competitive position of producers. However, the extent to which this is a regional rather than a national policy issue is debatable: cocoa producers compete within the region and may have difficulty in agreeing common objectives.

Other important issues include:

- European development agencies have a poor record on funding capacity building for management systems and research networks; and
- it is important to establish stronger links between research and policy discourse. Research programmes with less ambitious aims and tighter deadlines can provide more manageable, relevant and timely inputs into decision-making processes, and that have greater influence on policy.

Remaining questions include:

- how best can producers be involved?
- what added-value is there in taking a regional approach?
- What type and degree of donor funding is required to support the establishment of an effective network? Is it affordable?

Establishing policy networks is a complex task which requires a flexible, iterative approach. The challenge of institutional complexity often overshadows core research objectives. Success ultimately depends on donor commitment to support lengthy processes of negotiation between various stakeholders, and on the fundamental commitment of West African countries themselves: without national ownership, there can not be any long term sustainability.

Study 3: Research-extension-farmers' organisation linkages¹⁰

(Pierre-Marie Bosc, CIRAD-Tera, Karim Hussein, ODI and Jean Zoundi, INERA, Burkina Faso)

Overview

This study in West and Central Africa was carried out within the framework of the CORAF Initiative, with support from MAE,

¹⁰ Copies of the full research summary distributed at the workshop are available from ODI and further publications from the organisations referenced in Appendix 1 (p. 73).

Establishing policy networks is a complex task which requires a flexible, iterative approach.

Success ultimately depends on donor commitment to support lengthy processes of negotiation and on the fundamental commitment of West African countries themselves.

DFID and the EU. Field studies were carried out in Cameroon, Ghana, Guinea, The Gambia and Burkina Faso by the ODI/CIRAD/CORAF team. A sixth study was carried out in Nigeria by a consultant commissioned by DFID, using the same analytical framework.

Farmers' organisations can play an important role in supporting their members' livelihoods where they are: representative; federated at a level higher than the village; legally and formally accepted by government; and members have in common a profitable economic activity or the production of a key commodity.

Farmers' organisations can play an important role in defending their members' interests where they are: representative; federated at a level higher than the village; legally and formally accepted by government; and members have in common a profitable economic activity or the production of a key commodity. However, it is also important for there to be a favourable political, legislative, institutional and macro-economic context if strong linkages between farmers' organisations, agricultural research and extension organisations are to develop. In addition, there is a need for:

- a continued policy of decentralising national agricultural research institutes;
- material incentives for researchers to engage in participatory research and dialogue with farmers' organisations; and
- establishing consultative frameworks that are more representative of farmers' organisations (not solely involving private farmers).

Lastly, it is crucial for farmers' organisations' technical capacities and resources to be strengthened if they are to be able to articulate their needs and demands to agricultural service providers more effectively.

Aims and objectives

The programme aimed to address a number of well-established research issues in the light of the following social, political and economic developments in West Africa:

- technological innovation and its appropriation by producers;
- the crisis of research and extension systems and their financing; and
- the emergence of new development actors and the quest to identify their roles.

The programme merged the research interests of ODI (farmers' participation in agricultural research, NGOs and the role of the state) and CIRAD-Tera (farmers' organisations, agricultural research and innovation). The study examined the role of agricultural research in technology generation and dissemination processes and, more specifically, the role that farmers' organisations and other civil society actors play in these. The main objective of the study was to highlight the technical, economic and institutional conditions that influence the development of effective collaborative linkages between research systems, farmers and farmers organisations.

The research was conducted at the regional and national level, actively engaging with national research institutes in each country. The distribution of activities was balanced between francophone and anglophone countries (The Gambia, Ghana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Guinea, and Nigeria). While there was considerable convergence on priority research issues and analytical framework, there were some differences in the methodological approach applied by the different country teams. Nonetheless, this collaborative initiative established strong and lasting professional and institutional relations between French, British, and anglophone and francophone West and Central African partners.

Activities and outputs

A common analytical approach and conceptual framework was first developed by the research team, drawing on a literature review. Sixteen previously undocumented case studies were examined in the field, permitting comparative analysis of diverse organisations and types of linkages. Case study results were analysed at a workshop in Montpellier, France, at the end of 1998 and preliminary project findings were presented and discussed with senior CORAF representatives in Dakar, Senegal, in January 1999. An extended list of outputs can be found in Section C, Appendix 1, page 73 which includes a number of resources available on the internet.

Problems encountered

Three main problems were encountered. Firstly, the involvement of local farmers' organisations was fairly limited in comparison with the involvement of the donors, research institutions and CORAF. The research process was characterised by lengthy negotiations between the latter, generating high transaction costs. Secondly, the collaborating donors operated different funding mechanisms that made it difficult to mobilise funds for the study quickly. Thirdly, promotion and dissemination of programme outputs could have been more extensive, particularly at the grassroots level. This could have made a real contribution to future development of effective linkages between actors.

Lessons learned

The following lessons were identified:

- the political, economic, legislative and institutional context is critically important in creating an enabling environment for agricultural research, extension agencies and farmers' organisations to form partnerships with other actors;
- there is a high degree of diversity amongst farmers' organisations, in particular in terms of organisational structure (e.g. federal or not), representativity, scale of activities and place in the national legislative framework;

An enabling political, economic, legislative and institutional context is critically important for agricultural research, extension agencies and farmers' organisations to form effective partnerships.

Successful collaboration between agricultural research and farmers' organisations depends on research policies oriented towards development needs; participatory approaches to research; the existence of effective means by which research can capitalise on and learn from experience; and strengthened regional collaborative networks.

- the capacity of organisations to undertake economic coordination varies significantly across country contexts;
- collaboration between agricultural research and farmers' organisations depends on a minimum number of conditions: research policies oriented towards development needs; participatory approaches to research; means by which research can capitalise and learn from experience; and strengthened regional collaborative networks;
- building linkages between research and farmers' organisations implies a reciprocal recognition of the value of the roles of each and a clear division of responsibilities;
- partners must also be ready to accept that partnership involves significant transaction costs; and
- the strength of social capital and varying institutional density in each context are key issues defining the potential for successful linkages.

Policy recommendations and themes for future work

In order to realise the full potential of collaboration with farmers' organisations, especially in making agricultural services more demand led, this study highlighted the need to:

- support the emergence of farmers' organisations, and strengthen their economic, management and technical capacities, with a particular emphasis on supporting the development of their technical and economic objectives;
- assist extension services and research organisations to take into account the requests, or demands, of farmers' organisations and formulate them into research issues through a discussion process with farmers' organisations (alongside training in participatory methods);
- assist farmers' organisations and civil society actors in formulating requests for research and in participating in research processes, especially through the creation of 'catalytic' research and extension funds;
- strengthen the capacities of research, extension and farmers' organisations to work together;
- further investigate the effectiveness of various organisations in terms of support for producers; and
- develop methodologies to strengthen the capacities of farmers' organisations to play an active role in policy formulation.

Summary of discussion

- **Comparative advantages of regional approaches to rural development compared to national approaches.** Regional approaches to research rooted in successful local-level collaboration between research systems and rural stakeholders benefit from closer relationships between actors and a deeper

understanding of the importance of context. Questions and issues that can be addressed by research can thus be better targeted to the real problems faced by farmers in each context. However, where regionalisation is limited to the sum of individual country priorities, rather than understood as truly regional, transnational comparative approaches that takes precedence over national ones, it tends not to produce the same results.

- **Identifying priorities.** Technical research and extension priorities in West and Central Africa can be more accurately defined when both upstream and downstream economic problems are being handled carefully by a producer organisation that has a role in co-ordinating the whole process.
- **Roles of different actors.** The roles of research and the process of interaction between different actors involved in the technology generation and dissemination process are difficult to assess in the following areas: resource management involving complex decision-making processes; and where there is unequal control over rules governing access to resources.
- **Making research and extension services more downwardly accountable to end-users.** Making agricultural services more downwardly accountable is essential, but implies serious reorganisation. Initiatives to resolve lack of accountability often originate from the grassroots, particularly where producers are organised at a regional, transnational level. In this context, research and extension services not only need to be strengthened, but researchers need to become more aware of producer needs. Those needs cannot emerge without both sides making a significant investment in processes of dialogue. This, in turn, should lead to a better mutual understanding and to a process of building 'the demand' together (although, the demand for research per se is rarely overt or self-evident).
- **Not all producer organisations are good partners for research and extension.** Some producer organisations are poorly funded and cannot take part in the process of building demand for agricultural services. Others are often operating from a restricted geographical base that does not provide the necessary scale to develop successful collaboration with agricultural research institutions. On the other hand, certain farmers' organisations can become very effective partners. Although research organisations are not always receptive to the demands of farmers' organisations, there is a need to build the capacities of both the producer organisations and research systems to enable them to better co-ordinate their activities.

Making agricultural services more downwardly accountable to end-users is vital. Partnerships with producer organisations are a key avenue to achieving downward accountability.

One problem is whether the poorest and marginalised producers are able to voice their concerns adequately.

A significant problem is the degree to which the poorest and marginalised producers – those least likely to benefit from top down extension – are able to voice their concerns. Organisations representing the poorest groups often have to struggle to demonstrate legitimacy. They are also often male dominated whilst in some places the majority of producers are women. However, many farmers' organisations recognise the concern for legitimacy and some restructuring is taking place to refocus attention on the grassroots.

Key issues arising include the following:

- it is important to consider research-extension-farmers' organisation linkages in the wider context of bilateral and multilateral NGO activities;
- the relationship between research systems and farmers' organisations within commodity chains in different socio-economic and institutional contexts is still unclear;
- the priorities of farmers' organisations vary and they represent different interest groups which may have conflicting objectives: How, then, can they fit into decentralised development processes and in national policy consultations? For which constituencies do they speak and whose interests are not represented? What sort of dialogue should they seek to establish with governments and international donors?
- to what degree are the objectives of poverty alleviation and increased production compatible? Can farmers' organisations achieve both, or should donors work with different actors in pursuit of each objective?

Session 2: Lessons from Non-FBI Initiatives

Non-FBI Initiative 1: Pastoral organisations¹¹

(Ced Hesse, IIED)

Overview

This presentation provided an overview of work undertaken by the Drylands Programme of IIED, with funding from DFID. The project was initially designed as a specific component of a broader regional pastoral research initiative implemented by the Programme Régional d'Appui au Secteur d'Elevage Transhumant (PRASET) in collaboration with CILSS, PADLOS and the Club du Sahel. The project was reoriented following PRASET's closure in 1998.

Recent democratisation and decentralisation reforms in many Sahelian countries offer opportunities for greater involvement of civil society in governance issues. There is however a relative absence of organised pastoral civil society movements in the Sahel.

Background

Recent democratisation and decentralisation reforms in many Sahelian countries offer opportunities for greater involvement of civil society in governance issues, for example in land tenure and natural resource management. There is however a relative absence of organised pastoral civil society movements in the Sahel. The new generation of pastoral organisations has tended to consist of relatively small, locally-based groups involved in very specific small-scale activities. Amid growing concern that decentralisation processes and policy reforms are failing to consider the specificities of pastoral issues (especially tenure, derived rights and land use plans) this research focused on the issue of enabling pastoral groups to play a more informed role in policy debates and engage in national policy processes. Although the project is finished, the process that it initiated is ongoing.

This research focused on enabling pastoral groups to play a more informed role in policy debates and engage in national policy processes.

Aims and objectives

PRASET's central objective was:

promotion of a viable, dynamic and representative network of pastoral organisations capable of negotiating with local and national government bodies and the international aid community.

Following PRASET's closure, the project was reoriented to focus on the active involvement of pastoral groups in policy processes. IIED's role was redefined to consist of providing support to pastoral groups to enable them to better understand and determine how best they might engage in policy debates at local, national and regional levels.

¹¹ Copies of the full research summary distributed at the workshop are available from ODI and further publications from the organisations referenced in Appendix 1 (p.73).

Activities and outputs

IIED assisted with an institutional audit to identify and understand the strengths and weaknesses and future needs of existing pastoral organisations in West Africa. The audit covered a cross-section of pastoral associations in Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger and Nigeria. Analysis focused on capacity for effective representation, political negotiation and conflict resolution, resource management and financial autonomy in relation to the external political, legal and economic environment. Three case studies and a summary report were produced. A separate institutional audit of pastoral associations in northern Nigeria was also carried out.

In the light of PRASET's closure, a consultation process was begun with pastoral associations and other stakeholders to reorient the project. A series of self-awareness raising workshops on Sahelian pastoralism were held involving 40 representatives of 17 pastoral associations. Finally, strategies for involving pastoralist groups in the definition of new legislation on pastoral land use was elaborated in Burkina Faso and Niger.

Results

- Research reconfirmed well-documented issues facing pastoralists, including weakness of pastoral civil society movements, and the lack of significant evolution in government/donor policy regarding the pastoral sector.
- The degree to which key players in the policy process understand pastoralists and their needs has not improved. The majority of pastoral organisations are products of external support, implementing government, donor or NGO-initiated policies; they also tend to be financially dependent on their funding institutions.
- A majority of pastoral organisations are failing to address problems of internal accountability, representation, poor management and limited economic impact.
- There have been numerous attempts to generate collective awareness, adult education, literacy, empowerment, co-ordination of activities and exchange of ideas, moving towards local ownership of the policy process.
- An informal coalition of pastoral groups has been created in Burkina Faso and Niger, focusing attention on critical issues of common concern. This resulted from a number of awareness-raising workshops. The future sustainability of these coalitions, however, remains uncertain.

The degree to which key players in the policy process understand pastoralists and their needs has not improved.

A majority of pastoral organisations are failing to address problems of internal accountability, representation, poor management and limited economic impact.

Lessons learned

The project noted a number of positive lessons including, in this case, the flexibility of donors to do an about-turn to follow up interesting issues. The relatively small number of good partners

and the support of key individuals were essential to the project's success. Another important factor was the policy opportunity created by the proposed introduction of pastoral codes, which focused attention on the core issues addressed by the study. This was combined with an apparent desire by many pastoral groups to bury differences and address common issues of importance.

On the other hand, negative points included the problem of insufficient links with policy apparatus in order to implement activities following the closure of PRASET. Also, there has been no follow-up or apparent donor interest in taking forward research results. Weak case study material from francophone West Africa and the difficulties of reconciling many divergent agendas were persistent constraints. Lastly, the inappropriateness of large, donor-led fora to provide a platform for pastoralists to articulate their case was noted.

Pastoral land tenure is a critical issue that remains high on the agenda of several Sahelian governments.

Land tenure laws and codes are beset with conceptual problems and are often overly interventionist and technical.

Ways of strengthening pastoral civil society need to be explored.

Future directions

- Pastoral land tenure is a critical issue that remains high on the agenda of several Sahelian governments.
- Land tenure laws and codes are beset with conceptual problems and are often overly interventionist and technical. They focus on defining fixed regulations rather than procedures for negotiated access. There is often insufficient recognition of pastoral-agricultural integration/interaction and of the essentially transnational character of pastoralism. However, balancing devolution of responsibility with maintenance of overall authority is problematic.
- A key question is how to address the problem of weak pastoral civil society. Also, who is going to participate in the design of policy or legislation, in implementation and monitoring? External agencies need to find innovative ways to facilitate without becoming embroiled in highly political issues.

Summary of discussion

Pastoralist land use systems do not recognise national boundaries and so neighbouring country legislation must be harmonised accordingly. Pastoral tenure issues are therefore one of the best examples of the added value of a carefully formulated regional approach over aggregation of national approaches to rural development policy issues.

Key issues that remain to be addressed include:

- is donor involvement in this area useful or necessary?
- is there a potential value in dividing responsibility for rural service delivery and awareness-raising/empowerment activities?

Non-FBI Initiative 2: Public policies in the fight against poverty and inequality¹²

(Marc Levy, GRET/IRD)

This study emphasised the importance of understanding the international context within which public policy is formulated.

Background and results

This study emphasised the importance of understanding the international context within which public policy is formulated. While not a new theme, poverty reduction has become the dominant priority for donor development assistance policies, despite the structural adjustment and economic liberalisation policies that have marked the last fifteen years. This renewed stress on poverty reduction is in part due to the inclusion of social and political instability in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Eastern Europe which was provoked by neo-liberal economic policies and now threatens economic growth. This has led to a lack of public confidence in key international institutions (particularly the International Monetary Fund and World Bank). The consensus to work towards poverty reduction has been accompanied by a growing criticism of aid policy and a general downward trend in funds available for development assistance.

The renewed donor stress on poverty reduction provides an important conceptual and operational opportunity. The disconnection of growth and poverty reduction, and the correlation between inequality and poverty, demands critical reflection on existing models of growth and redistribution. International donor agencies must once again re-evaluate the relative position of social and economic aspects of development and confront the fundamental problem of inequality more directly.

Care must be taken to link macro-level policies (international and national policies for poverty reduction) with micro and meso-level contextual realities as these are totally interdependent.

The study concluded that care must be taken to link macro-level policies (international and national policies for poverty reduction) with micro and meso-level local contextual realities as these remain totally interdependent. However, methodologies for effectively developing national policies that take varied contexts and diversity into account (bridging the macro-micro divide) are still not well developed.

Social dynamics and the roles of intermediaries (e.g. farmers' organisations and local authorities) must be taken into account in formulating public policy on development and poverty reduction.

A second key conclusion was that social dynamics and the roles of intermediaries (e.g. farmers' organisations and local authorities) must be taken into account in formulating public policy on development and poverty reduction. Civil society organisations have an important part to play in achieving poverty reduction at the local level.

¹² Copies of the full research summary distributed at the workshop are available from ODI and further publications from the organisations referenced in Appendix 1 (p.73). See also Appendix 2 for contact details (p. 78).

Summary of discussion

Difficult relations between civil society organisations and central government are often related to the uncertain role of the state in the context of economic liberalisation. For example, questions surrounding policies of liberalisation must also be linked to the surrounding issues of microfinance provision. Linking the micro, meso and macro levels is also crucial, and national policy issues need to be understood in relation to the international context. However, the creation of an economic policy environment conducive to poverty alleviation may not be reflected in what happens on the ground, as this is inevitably mediated by local structures.

It was suggested that public policy ought to be regarded as an intermediary between the local and international context. Processes of arbitration and negotiation of public policy by social players are therefore of key interest. An important question to be addressed is how to combine the study of local level social dynamics with the study of broader policy processes.

Non-FBI Initiative 3: EC rural development policy¹³ (Luc Lefebvre, ADE)

This presentation provided an outline of the EC's development of new strategies of rural development aid and the main trends that have led to current policy. It reflected the views of an independent consultant and not necessarily the official position of the Commission.

The latest EC guidelines for assistance to developing countries are more people centred, emphasise aid effectiveness and recognise that nations are subject to global interdependence.

Summary documents detailing the main features of EC rural development policy and strategy have been circulated widely.¹⁴ The latest guidelines for assistance to developing countries reflect important new assumptions guiding development aid. The aid system is now much more people-centred and it is now recognised that aid is not limited in time, but rather that fiscal transfers will be necessary over much longer periods. The new emphasis is not on the sustainability of aid but on the effectiveness of aid. Nations are no longer regarded as economically independent but subject to global interdependence and global issues. Key questions relate not to how to protect countries from global market forces but how to integrate them so that they can take advantage of opportunities. The developmental role of the state is now considered much more

¹³ Copies of the full research summary distributed at the workshop are available from ODI and further publications from the organisations referenced in Appendix 1 (p. 73).

¹⁴ These are all available at <http://www.rurpol.org>.

Donor responses include privatisation, institution building, promoting civil society and good governance, decentralisation and regionalisation.

limited. Donor responses such as privatisation, institution building, promoting civil society and good governance, decentralisation and regionalisation are proposed. However these have deep consequences for rural areas where institutional capacities to fulfil new developmental roles are often limited. Processes of 'institution building' of various kinds will therefore represent one of the most significant challenges for donors in the near future.

The EU development aid mandate was defined at Maastricht where the following goals were identified:

- contributing to poverty alleviation;
- supporting growth by enhancing competitiveness;
- promoting democratic principles and human rights; and
- ensuring sustainable institutional settings and environmental management.

In terms of achieving these objectives six categories of constraints and six related levels of action have been identified. These form the overall development policy framework.

Constraints	Expected results
- <i>Political</i>	More peaceful, open, equitable and democratic societies, ensuring security and equal rights to all
- <i>Institutional</i>	More effective and accountable institutions, in the public and private sector as well as through the promotion of civil society
- <i>Economic</i>	Economic policies enhancing equitable growth
- <i>Individual</i>	Enhancing individual assets through the supply of social services such as education and health
- <i>Environmental</i>	More sustainable practises and fair cost sharing
- <i>Other EU policies</i>	Improving coherence between development policy and other related policies e.g. agriculture, trade, fisheries, environment, immigration

Coherence between EU policies is crucial to avoiding contradictions between the principles promoted by the aid system and actual policies of various departments and sectors.

Coherence between EU policies is crucial to avoiding contradictions between the principles promoted by the aid system and actual policies of other departments and sectors. Furthermore, co-ordination and coherence between member state donor activities is essential. Following extensive consultation and negotiation with member states, a diagnostic report on the main trends and issues facing rural populations was formulated. As a result the particular purpose of EU aid to rural development was defined as: '*supporting sustainable trends of improvement of the livelihoods of the rural populations in developing countries*'.

The EU approach to achieving this is to build country profiles following seven clearly defined steps. The resulting Rural

The proposed EC rural development policy is built around understanding the relationships between national policy frameworks, regional and local contexts, the diversity of rural groups, their assets and the ways in which the rural poor construct their livelihoods.

In practice it has been difficult to identify viable aid alternatives to state-focused approaches.

Shared values are key building blocks for development partnerships.

Will poverty be accepted as a global problem to be addressed via global instruments?

Development Profile and Strategic Framework (RDPSF) is both an analytical and strategic instrument that aims to identify how EU rural development policy can be achieved in a specific country. It therefore involves considerable dialogue between the EU and partner countries as to their respective commitments to reform and support for rural development. The RDPSF process aims to increase stakeholder ownership of policies promoted by the EC. It emphasises a participatory approach, decentralisation of policy design and implementation, long-term support to sustainable poverty reduction and the promotion of shared development values and objectives. The proposed policy is built around understanding the relationships between national policy frameworks, regional/local contexts, the diversity of rural groups, their assets and the ways in which the rural poor construct their livelihoods.

Summary of discussion

It is difficult to find viable alternatives to state-focused approaches in practice. Working with the least developed and least powerful is difficult for donors used to dealing with the state. Key questions surround: the degrees to which the state and organisations that are proposed to replace the state are accountable; and finding complementarities between state and non-state actors. It was noted that the capacity of public sector, private sector and civil society organisations varies enormously. While working with the state remains key to effectively achieving poverty alleviation objectives, NGOs and the private sector are increasingly recognised as important partners in the process.

EU emphasis on the existence of 'shared values' is debatable. How far are these values really shared or imposed? How far do they really address local concerns? It was acknowledged that asymmetrical power play leaves little room for manoeuvre to claim national positions. However this is a general trend in the international aid system and not unique to the EU. Economic sovereignty is increasingly depleted and there is a strong disparity between political discourse and resource allocation. Nonetheless, the accountability of the aid system is improving in response to public demand for demonstrably more effective aid. This can only be achieved through working with states and development partners that share consensus on certain key values.

In the context of changing trends in development thinking, a key issue that is likely to continue to be a priority in 20 years time will centre on the results of the globalisation process: will poverty be accepted as a global problem to be addressed via global instruments or will there be a return to focusing on nation states?

Session 3: Lessons for Policy

Two working group discussions explored cross-cutting themes, operational issues and practical lessons for policy. These groups focused on lessons and actions appropriate to the regional¹⁵ and national levels.

Working Group 1: Regional issues

Three key questions guided the discussion:

- i Which issues affecting the West Africa region are pertinent to national policy processes?
- ii Where is a regional (i.e. West Africa-wide) approach of particular value?
- iii What are the key elements in a successful regional programme?

While it was generally agreed that there are obvious benefits (economies of scale) in neighbouring countries co-ordinating their research activities, it was noted that the benefits of regionalised research are often unevenly distributed. While there may be common interest in certain issues, the practical value of research outputs to each country is not always equal. Defining areas of greatest common interest is therefore problematic. There is also an important distinction to make between similar problems experienced at national level in different countries (e.g. health, education), and problems which operate at the wider regional level (e.g. drought, migration).

It was noted that the history of ex-British and ex-French colonies has left them with distinctive political, administrative systems. As a result there are elements of clear contrast between francophone and anglophone countries. In spite of the different historical legacies, similar challenges are faced by many of these countries, for example the need for mobility of pastoral livestock, the management of common pool resource (CPR) issues, and joint forest management (JFM) issues. The tools, methods and processes of investigating certain problems are replicable, for example those relating to legitimising customary land tenure, and there are important and interesting lessons to be shared between countries. There have already been substantial benefits from existing regional initiatives and the creation of regional fora that bring together specialists and

The benefits of regionalised research are often unevenly distributed.

There have already been substantial benefits from existing regional initiatives.

¹⁵ As noted earlier, this report uses 'regional' to refer to an approach that focuses on a number of countries in the same geographical area as distinct from bilateral approaches that focus on single countries. In this report, the region referred to is West Africa, although the CORAF Initiative focused on West and Central Africa as this is the region covered by CORAF/WECARD.

There are, however, political obstacles to regionalised approaches to development in West Africa.

NGOs in different countries are more likely to form regional networks than governments.

policymakers to learn from experiences in neighbouring countries.

There are, however, political obstacles to regionalised approaches to development in West Africa. Much depends on which actors and which countries benefit from regional links. For example, NGOs may benefit more than governments and states can be reluctant to adopt ideas and approaches from other states. Further, it is unclear how a regional approach can be coherent with donor bilateral strategies, when these are increasingly based on working directly with and through national governments (e.g. sector wide approaches and comprehensive development frameworks (CDFs)). For DFID, the key issue determining whether support is provided for regional initiatives is whether there is a demonstrable interest on the part of West African countries themselves in working at a regional level.

Box 1. Summary – Working Group on regional issues

- It is relevant to have regional exchanges and promote information sharing on areas of common interest, in particular: transborder issues, management of collective or common pool resources, shared resources, land tenure, resource access, migration flows, liberalisation of sub-sectors and commodity chains, national processes of consultation on policy and developing effective mechanisms to strengthen policy making capacities. While regional approaches may be problematic and involve high transaction costs, a regional policy and approach is necessary in areas with transnational dimensions. However, the emphasis should be on policy process and processes of lesson learning rather than policy actions (as here national prerogatives are likely to dominate).
- A pragmatic approach to actions is necessary, setting modest goals to investigate specific themes, making use of and building on existing networks and resources and disseminating results widely in an accessible format to 'make donor investment count'.
- Organisations such as the EC and the Club du Sahel may have a comparative advantage in taking regional approaches to rural development policy and practice.* In the current international context, where a growing number of international agencies emphasise national level approaches to development policy (e.g. PRSPs and CDFs), bilateral donors may find national processes and approaches more attractive. However these should still be linked into a coherent regional framework. In this context, the specific mechanisms that might help regional initiatives add value to on-going national level planning and policy formulation processes need to be identified and ways of improving the complementarity of interventions at these two levels need to be developed.

* See for example the Club du Sahel *Bulletin* (September–October 2000). This outlines the support provided by the Club to CILSS and the need for tackling food security issues in West Africa in a regional framework. This is linked to the on-going processes of preparing national Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers: positioning national PRSPs within a coherent regional framework that builds on the regional consultation frameworks developed by CILSS. Donors are even discussing the possibility of developing a regional PRSP for West Africa given the importance of this perspective.

Evidence from the case studies discussed above suggests that African civil society partners find it particularly useful to articulate their demands using evidence from other countries. NGOs in different countries are more likely to form regional networks than governments.

While regional networking may be desirable and advantageous in terms of achieving development objectives, it is very difficult to organise and manage. Broader, more informal networks that bring together a variety of different actors and initiate wider ranging dialogue between them is probably needed. It is, however, important when engaging with diverse actors to understand the composition of different organisations and the degree to which they can be truly representative. The question of representativity, and especially the degree to which organisations represent the interests of the poor, is key and remains problematic.

The question of representativity, and especially the degree to which organisations represent the interests of the poor, is key and remains problematic.

It is perhaps useful to distinguish between on the one hand networks for the exchange of information, and on the other applying research from one country in other settings (collective provision of a good with wider benefits).

Perhaps joint activities in themselves constitute true 'regionalisation' whereas exchange of information does not. Key questions therefore surround the process of facilitating learning and exchange between countries. However, the issue goes beyond receiving information to considering what to do with that information. For example, experiences of the impact of liberalisation could be shared constructively across regions. It is also important to distinguish the exchange of technical information from the formulation of policy, which is subject to predefined parameters and political priorities. Finally, for a regional approach to be effective, there is a need for greater dialogue between decision-makers in partners countries so that key issues of common interest are identified.

For a regional approach to be effective, there is a need for greater dialogue between decision-makers in partners countries so that key issues of common interest are identified.

Working Group 2: Issues relating to national policy

Two key questions guided the discussion:

- i. How can the capacity of different actors be strengthened and dialogue and engagement in the elaboration of policy be improved?
- ii. What kind of activities should such a programme entail? Which actors? What time frame? What European contribution? What topics?

The various stakeholders or actors with a significant interest in rural development in a given country must claim or 'own' national rural development policies for them to be relevant and successful.

The various stakeholders or actors with a significant interest in rural development in a given country must claim or 'own' national rural development policies.

In relation to this, three key questions arise.

- i. How can the key stakeholders be identified (farmers, producer organisations, farmer leaders, the poorest, private sector, others), whilst avoiding the trap of dividing actors up into artificial groupings that fit donor rather than national or local perspectives?
- ii. Who are the target populations or groups for capacity building and training?
- iii. How can national policy dialogue be enhanced and to what extent are governments going to be willing to accept the conclusions of such debate on policy?

In spite of a current increased emphasis on coherent, inclusive national policy planning processes where donors insist they are not driving policy (e.g. in relation to PRSPs and CDFs), but supporting coherent national development strategies, the balance of power between donors and national governments remains uneven. Donors have specific agendas and place conditions on their assistance, and these do not always fit with national policy objectives. Further, different donors have different objectives leading to a mix of complementary and conflicting activities that contribute to fragmented rural development interventions in the same country.

At the same time, public policy is a process and it is now generally accepted that debate relating to this process should take place at the national level – albeit that regional interests and policy fora may influence this debate. Debate at the national level may focus on specific issues, geographic areas or particular policy entry points. Outputs from the FBI projects have provided case study data and created valuable knowledge at the micro and meso levels that can be drawn upon to enhance current and future national policy dialogue and policy planning processes (e.g. national PRSP consultations). Such processes are generally supported by donors as a promising framework for policy development. They may also identify training and information needs drawn from key themes of the FBI and related programmes. However, it is still not clear that these processes adequately address the challenges facing the rural sector.

The capacities of actors and institutions to engage in constructive national policy dialogue need to be strengthened.

The capacities of actors and institutions to engage in constructive national policy dialogue need to be strengthened, while being realistic about the extent to which rural people and organisations desire to engage in consultations relating to issues beyond their specific productive interests. Promoting broad stakeholder participation in national policy dialogues requires an emphasis on training and capacity building – particularly for resource poor, technically untrained and non-government actors. In particular local organisations require improved literacy, skills in analysing their

situations, numeracy, management and technical skills, and strategic decision-making capacities in order to effectively articulate the needs and demands of their members and constituencies in policy debates. Finally, if they are to be effective, representative and appropriate partners in policy formulation and implementation, local organisations need assistance in becoming more accountable to their members. At the same time, effective instruments need to be established to make donors accountable to recipients and end beneficiaries.

This relates back to one of the key fundamental challenges in development: how can developing country citizens be empowered, and related to this, how can external actors help to create the conditions by which people are empowered to decide on the types of assistance they need? This will involve finding ways to move away from donor conditionality on aid to a situation where citizens can exert effective control on government development expenditure: replacing donor conditionality with citizen demand.

The FBI projects discussed above highlighted the value of working at the regional level, despite a tendency for current rural policy debates to be conducted at the national level. It was broadly agreed that co-operation at the regional level is valuable on key themes where this approach provides economies of scale. For example:

- regional training programmes for trainers in participatory approaches and collaborative approaches to service delivery can yield important lessons from diverse country experiences and provide a valuable stimulus for change;
- regional research can also help identify and develop effective tools and methods by which local stakeholders can articulate their claims/demands in the policy debate;
- regional agricultural policy initiatives (for example cocoa policy and REPA) are of critical importance as regional integration in West Africa remains a significant policy issue; and
- comparative regional approaches can help identify successful instruments for making agricultural services more accountable and demand driven, and establish ways to ensure decentralisation processes effectively increase the accountability of the state to citizens, and the relevance of development policy decisions.

Quality and availability of information remains critical, as is the capacity to analyse and understand it. Citizens require greater access to information and increased capacity to analyse and understand it in order to exercise their power to make authorities accountable. They may also benefit from help in interpreting the information available (e.g. adult education, literacy and training in civic duties).

This will involve finding ways to move away from donor conditionality on aid to a situation where citizens can exert effective control on government development expenditure: replacing donor conditionality with citizen demand.

Co-operation at the regional level is valuable on key themes where this approach provides economies of scale.

Building capacity and increasing empowered participation in policy negotiation and formulation is a long process requiring commitment over time.

Future European collaboration could also draw lessons from the process of collaboration to date and build on the links established with networks of actors.

Finally, to be successful, policy negotiation processes between various actors at the national level requires long term external support, informed by a deeper understanding of key features of

Box 2. Summary – Working Group on national policy issues

- It is necessary to identify specific rural development themes of key importance to each national context. What are the priority sectors ? in which geographical areas?
- Improved national consultation processes on policy are key, but national structures are generally slow to adapt, and they often do so only in response to outside pressures. Furthermore, their desire for dialogue is not always clear. However, collaborative initiatives and processes such as the PRSP do create a key space for dialogue and stimulus for change.
- Ways in which regional experiences of collaboration between agricultural service providers and producer organisations, establishing rights of access to natural resources and commodity policy can feed into and support national level policies need to be identified.
- Regional mechanisms should be designed that can feed into and support national level rural development initiatives. These might include:
 - dissemination of information using multiple media accessible to policy makers, development practitioners, and representatives of local people in West Africa;
 - design of appropriate training for different actors to enable them to engage in national processes effectively (e.g. improving the negotiation and technical skills of producer organisations; developing mechanisms to improve representativity within in civil society organisations; developing effective consultation frameworks at the national and local levels);
 - training trainers in participatory and capacity building methods; and
 - designing tools and methods that enable more actors to engage in and further development debates.
- To capitalise on the findings of the FBI programmes and broaden the dissemination of results a variety of state and non-state rural development actors need to be engaged in national and local debate, reflection and analysis. This could take place via a series of feedback workshops at the national and local levels in the countries covered by the FBI programmes.
- Information and training needs for partners, producers and civil society organisations need to be identified and addressed so they can make their demands and needs heard by service providers, legislators and political authorities, and to enable them to fully engage in national development debates so as to improve their influence on policy makers.

African societies. However, this support has to be provided sensitively so that donors do not over-influence outcomes in the short term and by doing so undermine long term processes of empowerment. Radical changes in the way policy is negotiated and formulated will not be achieved through short project interventions: building capacity and increasing empowered participation is a long process.

Additional perspectives from partners involved in the FBI

An email consultation was circulated prior to the workshop to the wider group of European and West African practitioners and researchers involved in the three FBI funded collaborative programmes. The consultation focused on West African partners, aiming to provide an opportunity for those unable to attend the workshop to feed in their perspectives on the process of collaboration, emerging themes and results. The key issues raised were fed into discussion and are summarised in Box 3.

Box 3. Summary – Email consultation of FBI programme partners

- The theoretical and methodological approaches of francophone and anglophone traditions are not mutually exclusive, but in many ways complimentary. Indeed, anglophone and francophone approaches are more effective in combination than either is alone when attempting to identify priority rural development constraints, problems and key issues. The process of collaboration itself enables development specialists to critically reflect on their own experience and highlights the particular strengths and weaknesses of each different approach.
- The key to successful collaboration is achieving an appropriate balance between the contributions of collaborating institutions: French, British, North and South. This is largely dependent upon the qualities of the individuals and institutions involved. Whilst strong individual relationships often result from collaborative ventures, formal institutional linkages are much harder to establish.
- Experience suggests that the potential benefits of collaboration are significant but remain largely unfulfilled. The potential benefits of collaboration will only be realised by sustaining increased levels of interaction over a longer period. This requires greater political and organisational commitment.
- Research, irrespective of how it is conceived or funded, must be seen to benefit rural people directly, immediately after or even during the research. There is a need for more meaningful and empowering participation of rural people in research and extension activities and better dissemination and sharing results in key decision making bodies.

Session 4: Conclusions and Taking Issues Forward

Panel discussion: Overview

(John Farrington (ODI, chair), Jeremy Stickings (NRIL), Jim Harvey (DFID), Luc Lefebvre (ADE), Bruno Vindel (MAE))

Discussion on rural institutions and policies for improved livelihoods and poverty reduction produced comments on the following themes: regionalisation; World Bank and EC rural development policy; Franco-British collaboration and future directions for the FBI; and finally, taking issues forward.

Regional approaches

The French and British governments are both heavily committed to national programmes and have not historically been very active in regional initiatives. It was suggested that regional initiatives can perhaps best help those people, groups who are underrepresented in government. The question of how to formulate regional approaches to rural development remains key. Within this debate, economic integration is an important issue where the EC has a comparative advantage.

The debate on regionalisation needs to be situated in the broader global context. All donor agencies now emphasise partnership with southern organisations and networks as a channel for funding. The World Bank is also putting increased emphasis on regional initiatives, but these must be based on consultation. The Global Forum has noted five key levels of organisation that must be involved at every level in from national research institutions down to local NGOs. CORAF/WECARD's restructuring process provides important practical lessons on taking such consultative approaches as it involved a series of discussion meetings to explore ways to integrate NGOs and civil society in defining regional research agendas. However, annual meetings for CORAF have showed that member countries often have quite different expectations from the organisation. CORAF is increasingly expected to play a dual role both in assisting with access to donor funds and as a source of technical support and staff. The potential future role of regional organisations needs to be considered in the light of experience in such existing initiatives.

The relative neglect of agriculture in the rural development and poverty reduction strategies recently promoted by the World Bank is of concern.

World Bank and EC rural development policies

The neglect of agriculture in rural development and poverty reduction strategies in the recent World Development Report of the Bank is of concern given continued importance of the productive sector to rural livelihoods.

Compared to bilateral partners, the EC has a comparative advantage in supporting regional co-operation.

EC rural development policy documents are not sufficiently explicit on institutional issues. EC policy is strong on the importance and implications of the globalisation context but not yet very well geared to specific rural development issues in each context. The FBI has provided an important political signal to member states to work together to address these issues more effectively. Finally, the EC has a mandate for and probably has a comparative advantage in the area of regional co-operation. Indeed, the promotion of regional coherence and targeted regional programmes are of particular interest to the EC.

Franco-British collaboration

The value of the FBI, the importance of collaboration and the desirability of encouraging future collaboration on key themes of common interest were generally agreed. The French and British governments support work in the same regions and both are key stakeholders in the EC. The need for greater co-ordination and coherence between the activities of donors is clear. The FBI has provided a good example of a joint initiative and, importantly, the FBI has led to the establishment of good relations and the exchange of ideas between francophone and anglophone specialists. Working together has strengthened mutual understanding, and contributed to overcoming the compartmentalisation of anglophone and francophone worlds. This is crucial in order to constructively deal with the occasional conflicts that naturally arise when partners discuss the finer details of policy, to draw lessons concerning methodological and operational approaches, and to identify priority themes for future rural development initiatives. Joint publications are a good vehicle for encouraging improved mutual understanding and identifying key areas of common ground.

Future directions for the FBI?

The framework of the FBI has formally ended and it was noted that the FBI programmes had not always matched the strength of contextual data with strong and effective policy recommendations. However, *ad hoc* collaboration could be possible on themes of common interest.

As for current rural development strategies, the Panel emphasised two things. First, the importance of continuing to work with and strengthen existing structures and networks, beginning at the national level, with work to enhance internal policy dialogue and identify a clear national demand for interventions. Donors are therefore placing increasing emphasis on messages coming from African governments and civil society. Any future regional work should be designed to support such initiatives. Second, programmes must now demonstrate how they contribute to achieving the International Development Targets.

Future initiatives should focus on strengthening local capacity to better articulate the needs and demands of rural people to governments and donors.

The workshop provided lessons on rural development policy and practice in the context of key issues and priorities for West Africa.

This suggests that future initiatives should focus on strengthening local capacity to articulate needs and demands to governments and donors. These must be representative of all key population groups and support agreed development priorities and international targets. This requires a balance between contributing to policy knowledge and building the capacity to implement it.

Conclusions

The FBI programmes generated interesting findings in relation to research methodologies, processes of collaboration, results and policy. The workshop provided lessons on rural development policy and practice in the context of key issues and priorities for West Africa. Lessons were concentrated in the following areas: the process of collaboration; sharing methods and approaches; donor responsibilities; linking micro, meso and macro levels; understanding the process of development policy formulation; capacity building for enhanced policy dialogue; and mechanisms for sharing and disseminating research results. There was some consensus on outcomes and methodologies. The outputs and outcomes of FBI programmes were thus clearly pertinent to current rural development policy and there would be considerable scope for future work to build on findings.

Some of the FBI programmes are ongoing and the full benefits have yet to be seen (e.g. CORAF). However, they are likely to continue to raise important issues as the outputs are fed into other ongoing processes (e.g. land tenure initiatives) and each has provided valuable lessons for the policy process.

Certain results are problematic for policy, however. For example, CORAF is reticent about working with farmers' organisations as while they are useful for technology dissemination and service delivery, it fears conflicts where farmers organisations act as civil society organisations lobbying for governments for change. Effective farmers' organisations are likely to retain this dual function, however.

Regional approaches have a place, but it has been difficult to find the right balance between national and regional approaches. Furthermore, funds available for regional approaches have to be identified. At the EC level, regional funds have tended not to be directed at agricultural production *per se*, but allocated to market reform, food security etc., however there may now be more flexibility in EC budgets to address cross-cutting issues. Indeed, there are currently indicative programmes for each sub-region with substantial funding available: for example, the EC is currently funding research in Eastern and Central Africa (through ASARECA), and initiative that sets an important precedent for

major regional funding of agricultural research.

While EC member states meet on a fairly regular basis to communicate and formulate EC policy, consensus tends to be limited to general issues. French and British collaboration can particularly add value where it can constructively influence EC approaches to rural development and demonstrate coherence between member country strategies – a key concern for the EC. The importance of disseminating findings of initiatives such as the FBI to key individuals in EC and engaging them directly in discussion on specific conclusions is clear, as is the need to share results at other EC-sponsored fora for the discussion of rural development.

Taking issues forward

Specific issues that could be addressed in future collaborative programmes include: questions of accountability, liberalisation, and diversification of means of subsistence. Further, strengthening the capacity of key players to develop an enhanced internal policy dialogue in partner countries would be beneficial and donors have an important role to play in creating a context conducive to the reinforcement of these capacities. The outcomes of Franco-British Initiative should influence both the analytical and institutional approaches to French, British and EC rural development policies. Those involved could draw up clear summary lessons and formulate proposals as to how to capitalise on them.

**Potential issues for
future collaborative
initiatives**

However, to justify future collaborative programmes, and increase the impact of programmes presented here, it will be necessary to:

- highlight the key lessons that stem from past initiatives;
- demonstrate the relevance of outputs to contemporary policy concerns; and
- present lessons at the right time in formats highly accessible to decision makers and tailored to feed into a range of ongoing international policy debates.



Section B: Synthesis

Key issues

Lessons from the process of collaboration

Collaborative Franco-British-West African approaches experienced specific difficulties and limitations resulting from working in multi-lingual teams, and bringing together specialists from highly different disciplinary and working cultures. This added significant transaction costs to the collaboration and slowed the process of implementing the programmes. Nonetheless, these collaborative programmes showed very positive results in the following areas:

- the need for translation of concepts between English and French provided important opportunities for debate on concepts and methods, helped bring different visions of rural development closer and to build foundations upon which deeper analysis and more fruitful collaboration can be developed;
- the added value of having combined French-British steering committees including donor and stakeholder representatives for programmes covering the West Africa region as this provides comparative perspectives; and
- the importance of taking a regional perspective on emerging issues in rural development in West Africa.

The comparison of processes of change in francophone and anglophone countries provides important lessons.

The comparison of processes of change in francophone and anglophone countries provides important lessons on: decentralisation, the appropriate roles of the state and private actors (private firms, farmers' organisations and civil society) in rural development, complexity of livelihoods and diversity of situations.

The collaborative programmes have shown that long term multi-disciplinary technical support is critical in strengthening the capacities of African partner institutions and development specialists.

These collaborative programmes show that long term multidisciplinary technical support is a critical factor in strengthening the capacities of African partner institutions and development specialists. Despite difficulties encountered when processes of partnership were over-institutionalised or too formalised, these programmes helped to identify skilled and capable African partners, and also a group of resource persons that can contribute to improving the capacity of African countries to better define and articulate their rural development policy priorities. This strengthening of social and professional capital through regular contact between European development specialists and West African partners has generally increased trust and confidence in the value of partnerships. While the long term impact of these programmes remains somewhat intangible at present, its importance and

significance will become more apparent over years to come through other joint initiatives.

For future collaborative processes to effectively feed into policy, the timing of research and analytical work is key. It must be completed in a short space of time to feed into the current processes of donor spending reappraisal. However, this may limit the depth of analysis. Results also need to be presented in digestible, policy-oriented formats and disseminated through a variety of media (e.g. using electronic media, workshops and summary briefing papers).

Value of regional approaches

National governments and civil society can benefit from regional approaches in a number of ways. Despite the great diversity of contexts, the regional approach to analysing rural development and policy in each of the FBI programmes led, through the comparative analysis of country experiences, to the identification of key cross-cutting themes and issues. These provide useful foundations upon which the formulation of future rural development policies can be based.

Further, developing an improved understanding of major underlying trends in rural development thinking in the context of an awareness of regional policies and strategies (e.g. in the areas of land tenure, liberalisation in export sub-sectors, improved accountability of and increasing the demand-led nature of agricultural services) contributes to the shared goal of strengthening the capacities of development actors and African policy-makers. It particularly assists development actors within African countries to analyse their situations, helping to put their experiences in perspective in the wider context of the experience of other (neighbouring) African countries. It also helps them to identify practical ways to develop their institutions and activities.

Issues for which the regional approach is particularly useful include land and natural resource access, shared 'collective resources' (e.g. plant genetic material); liberalisation of sub-sectors (e.g. cocoa), and transborder issues (e.g. migration) (cf. Réseau d'Expertise sur les Politiques Agricoles (REPA)). Donor interest in funding REPA has been precisely to get a better balance between contributing to policy knowledge and building capacity to contribute to it – not simply focusing on implementing policy.

Actions to improve national dialogue on policy are not only necessary for effective natural resource management, but also contribute to other objectives such as good governance. Regional approaches should perhaps focus on mechanisms that support such

national level processes rather than those that solely operate at the regional level. Certainly, from the perspective of DFID, national processes are currently paramount and it is important to identify exactly where regional approaches might add value in order to justify investment in them.

Linking micro, meso and macro levels

Whilst the three programmes generally did not focus on macro-level policy, they each yielded a wealth of new empirical case study data – particularly at the local, micro-level and intermediate or ‘meso’-level. This data covered linkages between national policies and the strategies followed by local people and their village level institutions. The data highlighted the importance of taking into account the diversity of local situations and the need for policy makers to draw on knowledge of local institutions, practices and contexts before formulating broad-brush policy agendas on rural development.

Policy process

There are three key lessons for policy processes.

- There is a need to place greater emphasis on understanding policy processes and processes of stakeholder interaction and learning. The processes of policy development, implementation and change need to be closely monitored and adapted in the face of changes in the wider context.
- Given the complexities of the issues and institutional structures involved in policy processes, it is important to take a pragmatic approach, setting modest goals and a specific, limited agenda at the outset on which to build rural development interventions. This links closely with the increasing recognition of the need to adopt a consultative, ‘process’ approach to developing successful rural development interventions.
- Successful policies depend on the extent to which the policy development process is claimed and owned by various stakeholders. Thus three key guiding questions are: how to identify relevant players/stakeholders? who are the target populations or relevant ‘public’? and to what extent are governments likely to accept public debate on national policy objectives?

Questions arising

- There is a tension between the thrust toward decentralisation and local empowerment and the risk of capture by local elites. Does local decision making need to be subject to national supervision to ensure fairness? There is a need to devolve power and decision making whilst maintaining accountability and fairness.

- There is a need to continue to reflect on the future role of the state: in particular, what are the appropriate roles of civil society, the private sector and the state? Has the state been rolled back far enough, or indeed too far? What can civil society reasonably be expected to do and where are the limits?

Practical lessons and pointers for future action

Donor responsibilities

Greater co-ordination among donors and between budgets managed by each donor is required.

- Greater co-ordination among donors and between budgets managed by each donor is required. This is particularly important among EC member states, and in the context of CDFs. Such co-ordination is necessary to avoid incoherence and conflict between policies and interventions.
- Donors must strike a careful balance between working with national governments and working with civil society – especially given that the public policy debate must take place at the national level, albeit informed by local and regional level discussions.

Building capacities for policy formulation among African partners

- It is important to identify ways to strengthen further the capacities of different collaborators (national government departments concerned with rural development and agriculture, other national institutions, international and national NGOs, local development organisations and actors) to contribute to rural development policy formulation in partner developing countries. This will also facilitate enhanced policy dialogue between diverse actors.
- Policy initiatives must include, as a priority, building institutional capacity for enhanced national policy dialogue and long term support for the process of negotiation between actors at different levels in African partner countries.
- In order to take advantage of opportunities to make a timely impact on policy, it is important to maintain a regional capacity to respond rapidly to emerging issues and policy debates. Adequately resourced policy and information sharing networks at a regional level may be the best vehicles for this if the required skills training and technical capacities exist. Loose institutional contacts alone are not sufficient to mobilise information and analysis rapidly and effectively.
- Further in-depth examination of the process and results of case studies where agricultural policies have been negotiated between the state, farmers and farmers' organisations will be very valuable (e.g. with the CNCR in Senegal; the plan/contract for the cotton sub-sector in Mali and national consultation on

agricultural policy in The Gambia). This could contribute to developing a methodology or approach that sets out key factors necessary (or best practice guidelines) for developing appropriate national agricultural and rural development policies.

- Farmers' organisations and other civil society actors need assistance in developing their strategic capacities to make decisions and influence policy through more effective engagement in processes of national dialogue on development policies (e.g. PRSP consultations with civil society). However, the degree to which governments are sincerely interested in promoting genuine dialogue is unclear even as increasing numbers of donors group together to support PRSP / CDF. Further, there is the possibility that in this process, donors will lose some of their flexibility to work with or through a wide range of non-state actors (academics, civil society organisations, NGOs etc).

Sharing and disseminating results

Modes for better dissemination of research findings to stakeholders and decision makers need to be developed.

- Modes for better dissemination of research findings to stakeholders and decision makers need to be developed, in order to ensure that investments in rural development initiatives count. There is increased need to find innovative ways of disseminating the results of collaborative research programmes and policy initiatives at the international, regional, national and local levels. The latter presents a significant challenge and requires information presented in a format accessible to local users (for example, use of meetings, radio, training modules and integration into farmers' organisation capacity building processes). There is also a need to establish channels by which the results of such initiatives can be fed into EC discussions and shared among member states and other EC actors.
- The results of the FBI projects could be presented to, and discussed with, the key actors concerned in the six study countries, for example farmers' organisations, NGOs, national agricultural service providers, other national and regional government bodies and the commercial private sector. These meetings could be used to identify the content of any training or information dissemination activities to strengthen local capacities.

Relevance of studies to EC, UK and French rural development policies

Relevance of findings: overview

The workshop concluded that the FBI programmes provide a number of valuable lessons for policy. These could feed into the EC's formulation of a rural development policy and also inform current rural development policy debates in the UK and France. In particular, attention was drawn to the wealth of data provided on local institutions and practices in West Africa that emerged from the various research programmes (see Section C, Appendix 1, page 73).

The studies contributed lessons on how to reduce rural poverty and the steps donors and their Southern partners need to take to work together more coherently. Specific lessons covered:

- the value of *ad hoc* initiatives of donor co-operation of this type;
- the value of a regional approach in West Africa in connection with issues concerning shared 'collective resources' (e.g. plant genetic material), transborder migration and liberalisation of commodity markets (e.g. cocoa) – despite transaction costs and a certain number of practical problems (conflicts of interest, competition, linguistic political barriers);
- the importance of empowering and building the capacities of rural people and their organisations so that they constitute an effective demand pull on the state and service providers;
- the need to take rural diversity and diverse livelihood strategies into account when constructing national policies and not to treat rural people as a homogeneous group with the same rights of access to resources;
- the need to find ways to connect the local, the national and the regional (micro-meso-macro linkages);
- the fact that successful collaboration is based on building genuine partnership and shared commitment, although it must be acknowledged that this can take time and often requires significant investments;
- the observation that collaborative research needs to have an institution-building component, which strengthens the technical, methodological and analytical capacities of West African partners;
- the need for partnership to begin early, at the stage of research planning, and the value of steering committees with members drawn from each of the sponsors of a research programme;
- the value-added in investing heavily in dissemination of the results of collaborative programmes and initiating dialogue with rural people and policy-makers to take issues forward;

- the need for donors and other international actors to promote full national dialogue and negotiation over development policy;
- the observation that the capacities of farmers' organisations and other non-governmental actors to effectively engage in processes of national dialogue that influence policy (e.g. PRSPs) are limited, and that there is therefore a need to promote human resource development in these;
- the conclusion that member state initiatives like the FBI can provide rich micro level data to inform EC rural development policy and wider EC strategic planning processes, given that the EC has a limited capacity for micro level data collection; and finally
- that future regional initiatives could increase their policy relevance by taking into account current important national level processes, for example PRSP development, holistic livelihoods approaches, sector-wide approaches, country-level CDFs and commitments to meet international development targets.

Key issues and lessons

The FBI programmes provided insights in the following areas.

- **New data on livelihoods strategies and assets.** The data collected on livelihoods, livelihood strategies and assets available to a range of rural producers provide information on entry points to support poor rural people's livelihoods in a wide range of West African contexts.
- **Linking micro, meso and macro levels – lessons for the EC.** While the EC has much practical experience in strategy formulation and in implementing rural development programmes in collaboration with partners, it has been less successful in linking practical experience and micro-level data with strategy formulation. The EC would benefit from developing ways of collecting and summarising the results and knowledge of different rural development initiatives being promoted by member states and connecting them directly to EC strategic planning processes and domains of intervention.
- **Examples of how the results of bilateral initiatives on rural development can contribute to rural development policy formulation.** The EC can play a pivotal role in sharing information on collaborative initiatives. It can encourage and support further collaborative initiatives among EU members and strengthen the processes by which these can feed into the EC's decision-making processes and selection of specific rural development interventions.

The EC would benefit from collating and summarising the results of different rural development initiatives promoted by member states and connecting them directly to EC strategic planning processes and domains of intervention.

Taking issues forward: policy applications

Four key areas for taking forward issues raised in the FBI programmes were identified.

- **Future co-funded regional initiatives.** New French and British co-funding of rural development initiatives might be possible, but should be based on themes that fit with the specific policy orientations of both donors and the priorities of West African partners. Where themes emerge with clear commitment from West African partners, this would provide most potential for capitalising on the results of these programmes.
- **EC funds for collaborative regional initiatives.** The EC could be encouraged to set aside regional funds for further collaborative initiatives between European and African actors on rural development in West and Central Africa as it has a specific mandate for regional initiatives.
- **Informing the on-going process of formulating EC rural development policy and strategy.** While the EC has limited capacity to increase its own collection of micro-level data on diverse rural contexts, it can draw on the rich micro and meso-level data and analysis by these and other member state initiatives (such as the work of IIED on pastoral organisations and by GRET on poverty and inequality) to inform the development of more pertinent and appropriate rural development co-operation policies and frameworks which take into account the lessons from local organisations, institutions, rights and resources, and are built on the principle of subsidiarity, passing responsibility for decisions to institutions at the lowest practical level.
- **Informing a wider range of rural development policy actors.** To effectively inform UK, French and EC rural development interventions in Africa, contributions from these programmes could be submitted to the websites and other dissemination media managed by or for DFID, the MAE, the EC (the rurpol web-site), Inter-Réseaux, Cirad, ODI and IIED.¹⁶ The results of the FBI and other key national or bilateral initiatives could be presented and discussed at the planned annual EC rural development forum.

¹⁶ These websites are provided as examples and are not intended to be exclusive.

SECTION C : APPENDICES

Appendix 1: List of documents and publications produced by FBI Programmes

1. Land tenure and resource access in West Africa (GRET/IIED)

Co-ordinators: Philippe Lavigne Delville (GRET), Camilla Toulmin and Judy Longbottom (IIED)

Publications

- Cubrillo M. and Goisard, C., (eds), 1999. *Bibliographie et lexique du foncier en Afrique*. Ministère de la Coopération/Karthala, Paris.
- GRET/Coopération française, 1998. *Foncier rural, ressources renouvelables et développement dans les pays ACP, répertoire*. Paris.
- IIED, 2000. *Land Tenure Lexicon: A Glossary of Terms from English and French speaking West Africa*. IIED, London.
- IIED, 1999. *Land Tenure and Resource Access in West Africa: Issues and Opportunities for the Next Twenty-five Years*. IIED, London.
- IIED, 1999. *Régimes fonciers et accès aux ressources naturelles en Afrique de l'Ouest: Questions et opportunités pour les 25 ans à venir*. IIED, London.
- Lavigne Delville, P, Toulmin, C and Traoré, S. (eds), 2000. *Gérer le foncier rural en Afrique de l'Ouest: Dynamiques foncières. et interventions publiques*. Karthala – URED.
- Lavigne Delville, P, (ed), 1998. *Quelles politiques foncières pour l'Afrique rurale? Réconcilier pratiques, légitimité et légalité*, Karthala – Coopération Française.
- Lavigne Delville P., 1999. Comment articuler législation nationale et droits fonciers locaux : expériences en Afrique de l'ouest francophone. *Dossier Zones Arides*, No. 86. IIED, London.
- Lavigne Delville P., 1999. Harmonising formal law and customary land rights in French-speaking West Africa Drylands programme. *Issues Paper* No.86. IIED, London.
- Lavigne Delville P., 1998. *Foncier rural, ressources renouvelables et développement en Afrique*. Coll. Rapports d'études, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères – Coopération et francophonie. Paris. (English version included: *Rural land tenure, renewable resources and development in Africa*).
- Mortimore. M.. 1997. History and evolution of land tenure and administration in West Africa, *Drylands Issue Paper* No. 71, IIED, London.
- Mortimore, M., 1997. Histoire et evolution des regimes fanciers et de l'administration en Afrique occidentale. *Dossier Zones Arides*, No. 71. IIED, London.
- Toulmin, C., Lavigne Delville, P., and Traoré S., (eds), forthcoming. *The Dynamics of Resource Tenure in West Africa*, James Currey and Africa World Press, London.

Reports

- Amanor, K.S. and Diderutuah, M.K., 2000. Land and citrus contracts in the oil palm and citrus belt of Ghana. Report prepared for regional workshop at Ouagadougou. June, 2000.
- Anikpo, M., 2000. Derived rights and the security of tenancy in Oyigbo Local Government Area (LGA), Rivers State, Nigeria. A case study of Obigbo and Ndoki communities. Report prepared for regional workshop at Ouagadougou, June.
- Brégeot G., 1998. *Droits délégués en Afrique noire : revue à partir de la littérature francophone*. Document préparatoire pour la recherche, GRET/IIED.

- DFID / French Ministry of Cooperation, 1998. Land policy brief for the Committee of Ministers of Agriculture of West and Central Africa.
- Dittoh, S., 2000. Derived rights for gaining access to farm land in northern Ghana. Report prepared for regional workshop at Ouagadougou, June.
- Edja, H., 2000. Droits délégués d'accès à la terre et aux ressources naturelles dans le sud du Bénin. Report prepared for regional workshop at Ouagadougou, June.
- Kasanga, K. and Kotey, N.A., 2000. State Land tenure Administration and Modes for Land Resource Management at Regional and Local Levels. IIED, London.
- Goislard C., 1997. Stage: Foncier rural, ressources renouvelables et développement. Compte rendu, GRET.
- Goislard C., 1996. Stage: Foncier rural, ressources renouvelables et développement. Compte rendu, GRET.
- GRET/IIED, 1999. Les droits délégués d'accès à la terre et aux ressources : négociation, renégociation, sécurisation. Compte rendu de l'atelier d'Accra.
- Iyebi-Mandjek, O., 2000. Dynamique des droits délégués au nord du Cameroun: le cas des Mafa du piémont nord des monts Mandara'. Report prepared for regional workshop at Ouagadougou, June.
- Mamman, A. B., 2000. The incidence and nature of derived rights in the Sokoto Rima Basin, N W Nigeria. Report prepared for regional workshop at Ouagadougou, June.
- Ndiaye, I.C., 2000. Transferts temporaires et définitifs des droits de la terre à Mboyo et à Guede Wuro (département de Podor). Report prepared for regional workshop at Ouagadougou, June.
- Paré, L., 2000. Les droits délégués dans l'aire cotonnière du Burkina Faso. Report prepared for regional workshop at Ouagadougou, June.
- Tijani, A.I., Daura, M.M. and Gazali, W.A., 2000. Derived land rights in Lake Alau, north-east Nigeria. Report prepared for regional workshop at Ouagadougou, June.
- Université de Saint Louis/GRET/IIED (eds), 1997. Managing Land tenure and Resource Access in West Africa: Proceedings of a Regional Workshop held at Gorée, Senegal. Ministère de la Coopération / ODA.

Internet resources

The Drylands *Issue Paper* series are available on IIED's website (www.iied.org).

GRET has launched a website on land tenure issues: *Ressources Internet sur le Foncier, analyse de l'existant*, GRET, 1999. Also: Goislard C., 2000: *Projet de site Internet francophone: foncier, ressources renouvelables et développement, exploitation des questionnaires par rapport à l'intérêt du projet*. GRET.

2. Research – extension – farmers' organisation linkages (ODI/ CIRAD/ CORAF).

Co-ordinators: Karim Hussein (RPEG, ODI) and Pierre-Marie Bosc (CIRAD-Tera)

Reports

- Bosc, P.M., Bourdel, C., Dulcire, M., Oyep, J.E., Hussein, K., Sibelet, N. and Zoundi, J., 1999. CORAF Initiative: Strengthening Research-Extension-Farmers' Organisation Linkages in West and Central Africa. Overview paper. A study prepared for CORAF, UK DFID and the French Ministère de la Coopération. ITAD Ltd, ODI and CIRAD. June (also in French).
- Bourdel, C., Hussein, K., Oyep, J.E., Zoundi, J. 1999. Initiative CORAF : Renforcer la collaboration entre la recherche, la vulgarisation et les organisations paysannes en Afrique de l'ouest et du

- centre – Etudes de terrain Burkina Faso. A study prepared for CORAF, UK DFID and the French Ministère de la Coopération. ITAD/ODI and CIRAD. Mai.
- Dulcire, M., Hussein, K., and Oyep, J.E., 1999. Initiative CORAF : Renforcer la collaboration entre la recherche, la vulgarisation et les organisations paysannes en Afrique de l'ouest et du centre – Etudes de terrain Cameroun. A study prepared for CORAF, UK DFID and the French Ministère de la Coopération. ITAD/ODI and CIRAD. Mai.
- Dulcire, M., Hussein, K., Oyep, J.E., and 1999. CORAF Initiative: Strengthening Research-Extension-Farmers' Organisation Linkages in West and Central Africa. Field Studies: Ghana. A study prepared for CORAF, UK DFID and the French Ministère de la Coopération. ITAD Ltd, ODI and CIRAD. May.
- Hussein, K., Sibelet, N., Oyep, E.O., Zoundi, J.S., 1999. CORAF Initiative: Strengthening Research-Extension-Farmers' Organisation Linkages in West and Central Africa. Field Studies: The Gambia. A study prepared for CORAF, UK DFID and the French Ministère de la Coopération. ITAD Ltd, ODI and CIRAD.
- Hussein, K., Oyep, J.E., Sibelet, N., and Zoundi, J., 1999. CORAF Initiative: Strengthening Research-Extension-Farmers' Organisation Linkages in West and Central Africa. Field Studies: The Gambia. A study prepared for CORAF, UK DFID and the French Ministère de la Coopération. ITAD Ltd, ODI and CIRAD. May.
- Bosc, P.M., Oyep, J.E., and Zoundi, J., 1999. Initiative CORAF : Renforcer la collaboration entre la recherche, la vulgarisation et les organisations paysannes en Afrique de l'ouest et du centre – Etudes de terrain Guinée. A study prepared for CORAF, UK DFID and the French Ministère de la Coopération. ITAD/ODI and CIRAD. Mai.
- Bosc, P.M., Bourdel, C., Dulcire, M., Oyep, J.E., Hussein, K., Sibelet, N. and Zoundi, J., 1999. Initiative CORAF : Renforcer la collaboration entre la recherche, la vulgarisation et les organisations paysannes en Afrique de l'ouest et du centre – Synthèse et propositions. A study prepared for CORAF, UK DFID and the French Ministère de la Coopération. ITAD/ODI and CIRAD. Juin.
- Akinwumi, J.A., 1999. CORAF Initiative: Strengthening Research-Extension-Farmers' Organisation Linkages in West and Central Africa. Field Studies: Nigeria. A study prepared for CORAF, UK DFID and the French Ministère de la Coopération.

Internet resources

- *All available at:* <http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/essd/essd.nsf/producer/casestudies>
 - i ODI/CIRAD 1999. FEPRODEX: The Fédération de producteurs d'oignons de l'Extrême Nord (Maroua): Developing farmers' organisation for onion production in Northern Cameroon.
 - ii ODI/CIRAD 1999. ODI/CIRAD 1999. The Community Seed Project: Collaboration between Ministry of Food and Agriculture, the Savanna Agricultural Research Institute and seed production groups in northern Ghana.
 - iii ODI/CIRAD 1999. Sesame Growers' Associations: Partnership between Sesame Growers' Associations, Catholic Relief Services, research and extension: The birth of a dynamic farmers' movement?
 - iv ODI/CIRAD 1999. The Nyameng Kunda Kambeng Kafo: Partnership with ActionAid The Gambia for Sesame Seed Production and Processing.
 - v ODI/CIRAD 1999. Collaboration entre le Diocèse de Diébougou, les producteurs et l'Institut de l'Environnement et des Recherches Agricoles (INERA) pour l'adaptation et la diffusion de technologies relatives au niébé dans le Sud-Ouest du Burkina.
 - vi ODI/CIRAD 1999. Développement et diffusion de l'innovation au sein d'une OP, et liaisons avec la recherche: deux exemples dans le cadre de la Fédération des Groupements Naams (FUGN) au Burkina Faso.

- Available at: www.livelihoods.org (under: SLRG, Policy Institutions and Processes sub-group, Papers)
vii K. Hussein, 2000. Farmers' organisations and agricultural technology: institutions that give farmers a voice.
- See also RPEG section of ODI website: www.odi.org.uk/rpeg/

3. West and Central Africa cocoa policy research and analysis networking

Co-ordinators: Andrew Lawson (OPM), Jim Gilling (OPM) and Bruno Losch (CIRAD-Tera).

Reports

Shepherd, A., 1997. Concept note: the Impact of Liberalisation in the West African Cocoa Sector. Prepared for UK DFID, University of Birmingham, June.

West and Central Africa Cocoa Policy Research Networking, 1998. Project Memorandum. Prepared for UK DFID and the French Ministère des Affaires Etrangères. University of Birmingham, OPM, Cirad, July.

Daviron, B., Gilling, J., Losch, B., 1999. Réseau d'expertise sur les politiques cacaoyères en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre. Compte-rendu de la phase 1. Cirad-OPM, février.

Réseau d'expertise et de recherche sur les politiques cacaoyères en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre, en cours. Actes de l'atelier régional sur la libéralisation des filières cacaoyères en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre, Abidjan 16-18 novembre 1998.

Papers presented at the regional seminar

A regional seminar on West and Central African Cocoa Policy was held in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire in November 1998. Some 20 papers on cocoa policy and production in West Africa were tabled (see below).

H. Mamaah Ministry of Finance – Ghana	Cocoa liberalisation in Ghana: recent developments and new perspectives
B. Losch and B. Daviron CIRAD (France)	Cocoa liberalisation in West and Central Africa – elements of analysis
R. Simmons, LMC (England)	The experience of the coffee sector
J. McIntire and P. Varangis World Bank	Reforming cocoa marketing and pricing in Côte d'Ivoire
F. Ruf CIRAD (France)	Liberalisation of the Côte d'Ivoire cocoa sector – some lessons from the 'free market' in Sulawesi, Indonesia
S. Fambon FASEG (Cameroon)	Crisis, economic reform and the performance of the cocoa sector in Cameroon
K. Oussou CIRES (Côte d'Ivoire)	The implications of liberalisation on the cocoa sector in Côte d'Ivoire
J. Amoah COCOBOD (Ghana)	Cocoa liberalisation in Ghana: recent developments and outstanding policy research issues
K. Burger Free University (Amsterdam)	The market for cocoa and chocolate – liberalisation and the EU directive on substitute fats

K. Evlo and A. Mensah FASEG (Togo)	The macroeconomic impact of liberalisation reforms for the Togo cocoa sector
K. Tession FASEG (Togo)	Liberalisation policies and the cocoa sector in Togo: an economic efficiency approach
T. Defo FASEG (Cameroon)	Structural adjustment, demand and supply in the Cameroon cocoa sector
F. Olokesusi NISER (Nigeria)	Pesticide use in cocoa production and its environmental effects under liberalisation in Ondo State
B. Akanji NISER (Nigeria)	Liberalisation and market transformation in the cocoa economy of Nigeria - profiles and performance
S. Kalilou CIRES (Côte d'Ivoire)	A simulation of the impact of liberalisation on comparative advantage in the Ivorian cocoa sector
Y. Assamoi BNETD (Côte d'Ivoire)	Liberalisation policies and strategies of cocoa stakeholders in Côte d'Ivoire
S. Akande NISER (Nigeria)	Impact of liberalisation on fiscal development in cocoa and non-cocoa producing areas of Nigeria
G. Gohou World Bank (Côte d'Ivoire)	The impact of liberalisation on the price differential differential for Côte d'Ivoire cocoa
B. Francis, Cameroon	Determinants of Cameroon cocoa exports: 1970-97
T. Onouga CICC (Cameroon)	Liberalisation of cocoa markets in Cameroon and its impact on cocoa production in Cameroon
A. Adegeye and Y Yusuf University of Ibadan (Nigeria)	The structural adjustment programme in Nigeria and its effects on cocoa production, marketing and quality control
D. Atsé, CIRES (Côte d'Ivoire)	Policy reforms in cocoa marketing: the case for email.

Appendix 2: Participant contact list

France

Bruno Vindel
bruno.vindel@diplomatie.fr
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, DGCID-DCT/EPS
Tel: +33 (0)1 53 69 30 40 Fax: +33 (0)1 53 69 33 19

Olivier Durand
olivier.durand@diplomatie.fr
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, DGCID-DCT/EPS
Tel: +33 (0)1 53 69 30 64 Fax: +33 (0)1 53 69 33 19

Marc Lévy
levy@gret.org
GRET
213 rue Lafayette, 75010 PARIS
Tel: +33 (0)1 40 05 61 31, Fax: +33 (0)1 40 05 61 10

Jean-Pierre Chauveau
chauveau@mpl.ird.fr
IRD
BP 5045, 34032 Montpellier cedex
Tel: +33 (0)4 67 63 69 71

Bruno Losch
losch@cirad.fr
CIRAD-TERA
Programme Agricultures familiales, TA 60/15,
73 Avenue J.F. Breton, 34398 Montpellier Cedex 5
Tel: +33(0)4 67 61 55 55 Fax : +33 (0) 4 67 61 44 15

Pierre-Marie Bosc
bosc@cirad.fr
CIRAD-TERA

Denis Pesche
denis.pesche@inter-reseaux.org
Inter-Réseaux
32 rue Le Peletier, 75009 PARIS
Tel: +33 (0)1 42 46 57 13 Tel: +33 (0)1 42 46 57 13

UK

Alison Kennedy
a-kennedy@dfid.gov.uk
West and North Africa Dept, DFID
94 Victoria Street, London SW1E 5JL
Tel: +44 (0)207917 7000

Jim Harvey
jim-harvey@dfid.gov.uk
Rural Livelihoods Department, DFID

Derrick Akintade
d-akintade@dfid.gov.uk
Rural Livelihoods Department, DFID

Jeremy Stickings
J.C.Stickings@gre.ac.uk
NRInternational
Central Avenue, Chatham Maritime, Kent ME4 4TB
Tel: +44 (0)1634 883 084

Jim Gilling
james.gilling@opml.co.uk
Oxford Policy Management Ltd
6 St Aldates Courtyard, 38 St Aldates, Oxford OX1 1BN
Tel: +44 (0) 1865 207 300 Fax: +44 (0) 1865 250 580

Brendan Bayley
brendan.bayley@opml.co.uk
Oxford Policy Management Ltd

Camilla Toulmin
camilla.toulmin@iied.org
IIED-Drylands Programme
4 Hanover Street, Edinburgh EH2 2EN, UK.
Tel: +44 (0)131 624 7040 Fax:+44 (0)131 624 7050

Ced Hesse
ced.hesse@iied.org
IIED-Drylands Programme

Melissa Leach
m.leach@ids.ac.uk

Institute of Development Studies
University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9RE
Tel: +44 (0)1273 606 261

Simon Maxwell (Director)
s.maxwell@odi.org.uk

Overseas Development Institute (ODI)
111 Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7JD
Tel: +44(0)20 7922 0300, Fax: +44(0)20 7922 0399

John Farrington
j.farrington@odi.org.uk

ODI Rural Policy and Environment Group

Karim Hussein
k.hussein@odi.org.uk

ODI Rural Policy and Environment Group

Tom Slaymaker
t.slaymaker@odi.org.uk

ODI Rural Policy and Environment Group

Sylvie Cordier
s.cordier@odi.org.uk

ODI Rural Policy and Environment Group

West Africa

Dr Jean Sibiri Zoundi
zoundi@hotmail.com or
zoundi@fasonet.bf

Natural Resources Management & Production System Dept
Research & Development Linkage Service of INERA
04 BP 8645 Ouagadougou 04, BURKINA FASO
Tel: +(226)347112 & 340270, Fax: +(226) 340271

Abba Isa Tijani
abbatijani@hotmail.com

c/o 31 Turner House, Erasmus Street, London SW1T 4DZ
Tel: +44 (0)780 8510 435

EC consultant, Rural Development Policy

Luc Lefebvre (Director)
luc.lefebvre@ade.be

ADE
Traverse d'Esopo 6 Bte 9, 1348 Louvain-La-Neuve, Belgium
Tel: + (32) 10 45 45 10, Fax: + (32) 10 45 40 99

Appendix 3: Workshop programme

Objectives of the workshop

Since 1995, three West Africa-focused rural development initiatives have been jointly funded under the Franco-British Initiative (FBI) covering the following themes:

- research – extension – farmers' organisation linkages;
- land tenure; and
- cocoa policy research and networking

This workshop aims to capitalise on the products of this collaborative process and contribute to the improvement of development co-operation policy in West Africa. The specific objectives of the workshop are to share the results and outputs of these collaborative programmes, elaborate a constructive criticism of the process of collaboration (the benefits and the limitations) and inform current and future EC, French and British rural development policy. The workshop will also draw lessons from a small number of experiences outside the FBI.

Time	Topic	Session co-ordinator
Day 1		
10.30	Coffee in ODI Meeting Room	
11.00	Welcome and opening	Simon Maxwell, ODI
11.10	Introduction and overview :	
	Presentation of the Franco-British Initiative	Karim Hussein, ODI
	Presentation of the workshop objectives & programme	Denis Pesche, IR
	Introduction of participants	
PROCESS, RESULTS AND OUTPUTS		
11.30	Study 1: Land Tenure and Derived Rights	Camilla Toulmin (IIED) Jean-Pierre Chauveau (IRD) Abba Isa Tijani
12.15	Study 2: West and Central Africa Cocoa Policy Research and Networking	Bruno Losch (CIRAD) Jim Gilling (OPM)
13.00	Sandwich lunch provided	
14.00	Study 3: Research-Extension-Farmers' Organisation linkages	Pierre-Marie Bosc (CIRAD) Karim Hussein (ODI) Jean Zoundi (INERA)
LESSONS FROM OTHER INITIATIVES		
14.45	Pastoral Organisations	Ced Hesse(IIED)
15.15	Coffee Break	
15.30	Poverty and Public Policy	Marc Lévy (GRET/IRD)
16.00	EC Rural Development Policy	Luc Lefebvre (ADE)
16.30	Plenary discussion: Identifying cross-cutting themes, operational issues and practical lessons for policy to structure working group discussions	Facilitation : Camilla Toulmin, IIED Bruno Losch, CIRAD

Time	Topic	Session co-ordinator
17.45	Summing up and organisation of working groups	
18.00	End of Day One	
19.00	Workshop Dinner, Waterloo	
Day 2		
LESSONS FOR POLICY		
09.00	Overview of the previous day / Introduction to working groups	Karim Hussein Denis Pesche
09.15	Break up into 2 working groups to discuss cross-cutting themes, operational issues and practical lessons for policy	
10.45	Coffee	
11.15	Plenary: - Report back from working groups (15 minutes each) - Discussion of Lessons for EC, French and UK policy and rural development practice	Chair: Karim Hussein Denis Pesche
12.30	Sandwich lunch provided	
CONCLUSIONS AND WAYS FORWARD		
13.30	Panel discussion on rural institutions and policies for improved livelihoods and poverty reduction: Bruno Vindel; Jim Harvey; Luc Lefebvre; Jeremy Stickings	Chair: John Farrington
15.00	Coffee	
15.30	Concluding debate and taking issues forward	Chair: J.S. Zoundi with Karim Hussein and Denis Pesche
16.30- 16.45	Summing up	Karim Hussein Denis Pesche

Appendix 4: Workshop Organisers

The Overseas Development Institute

The Overseas Development Institute (ODI) is the UK's leading independent policy research institute in international development and humanitarian issues. Its mission is to inspire and inform policy and practice which lead to the reduction of poverty, the alleviation of suffering and the achievement of sustainable livelihoods in developing countries. It does this by bringing together high-quality applied research, practical policy advice and policy-focused dissemination and debate.

ODI has an international and multidisciplinary body of core staff and research associates. These work with partners in the public and private sectors in both developing and developed countries. ODI has a strong international reputation for rigorous policy-oriented development research and practice.

ODI also operates an extensive programme of publication and dissemination linking researchers, policy-makers and practitioners in the North and South. It holds a number of meeting series and international workshops on current topics of development policy interest. ODI also provides research support and advice to Parliamentary Select Committees and to the All Party Parliamentary Group on Overseas Development. Many publication series produced by ODI (research reports, natural resource perspectives and briefing papers series, journals) are publicly available through its website: www.odi.org.uk

The Rural Policy and Environment Group

The Rural Policy and Environment Group conducts interdisciplinary research, in collaboration with Southern partners, on the development of a more sustainable relationship between natural resources and rural livelihoods. The research focuses on both new methodologies and on policy and institutional change. RPEG has major programmes on conflict, livelihoods and biodiversity in relation to agriculture and NR management. The environmental and rural development agenda is complex and changing, and RPEG responds to its challenges through policy and advisory work and through its networks for information dissemination and exchange. RPEG includes specialists from social and natural science backgrounds, examining institutional, socio-economic, sociological, anthropological, political science and policy issues in the natural resources and environmental context.

RPEG has played a leading role in the promotion of a sustainable rural livelihoods perspective and has extensive experience of applied research in support of innovative systems for environmental development, technology generation and dissemination. RPEG publishes the Agricultural Research and Extension Network focusing on policy and institutional issues in relation to technology change in agriculture. It also publishes the series of Key Sheets for DFID: and the Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheets.

Inter-Réseaux

Inter-Réseaux brings together more than 3000 members from various professional fields, from both the North and South: farmers' organisations, consultancy firms, international solidarity organisations, researchers, trainers, academic bodies, administrative and aid professionals, representatives from the private sector and decentralised cooperation. The members of Inter-Réseaux are present in 60 countries. More than one hundred members are located in ten of the French-speaking African countries: Burkina Faso, Mali, Senegal, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Togo, Benin, Niger, Guinea and Chad.

The main objectives of Inter-Réseaux are:

- To increase and renew awareness of the need for North-South cooperation in the field of rural development.
- To present initiatives from producer organisations, and on a more extensive level, initiatives from rural populations.

To achieve these objectives, Inter-Réseaux increases the forums for debate between those involved in the rural development of the countries from the South. Inter-Réseaux uses an approach that directly links partners from the South to its activities. This association can take various forms: support in organising meetings, collaborative publications with the South, exchanges between members in similar, geographic regions, the compilation of country directories, etc.

Inter-Réseaux's orientations are defined by a steering committee that meets on a trimestrial basis. Based in Paris, its administrative staff (six persons) assures the co-ordination of activities. Currently supported by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Inter-Réseaux pursues its objectives through a framework of thematic groups, the organisation of meetings and seminars and through its publications and directories.

Every three months, Inter-Réseaux members receive the bulletin *Grain de Sel* presenting network activities, original initiatives in rural development, and providing thought-provoking articles on issues of international cooperation.

The Thematic Groups are designed to make in-depth examinations of important and controversial issues in rural development, and to bring to light the political, economic and social challenges they pose. For the 1999-2000 period, Inter-Réseaux is working in the following areas:

- How to support farmers and rural organisations
- Financing agriculture
- Improve use of new communication technology in rural development

Website: www.inter-reseaux.org

Appendix 5: Further contacts

The contact details for participating institutions (ODI, IIED, OPM, GRET, CIRAD-TERA, and ADE) are given on the inside cover and those of individual workshop participants are given in Appendix 2. The authors can be contacted as follows:

Karim Hussein
Denis Pesche
Tom Slaymaker

k.hussein@odi.org.uk
denis.pesche@inter-reseaux.org
t.slaymaker@odi.org.uk

In addition, contact details for the EC and CORAF/WECARD who contributed funds for the studies are given below:

Dr. Ndiaga Mbaye
Executive Secretary
CORAF/WECARD
BP 8237
Dakar-Yoff
Senegal

ndiaga@sonatel.senet.net

Mr. Philip Mikos
Directorate-General Development
European Commission
Brussels
Belgium

philip.mikos@cec.eu.int

This publication presents a summary of the results of three joint Franco-British West African research programmes undertaken since 1996 on rural development in West and Central Africa. Each programme was undertaken with regional partners. These research programmes focused on the following three themes :

- Strengthening linkages between agricultural research, extension and producer organisations
- Land tenure and access to natural resources
- Cocoa sector policy

The programmes contributed to an improved understanding of recent changes in rural West Africa through studies undertaken by teams of French, British and African researchers and development practitioners. These studies also identified and analysed new trends that need to be taken into account in the process of formulating development aid policies, provided lessons as to how to improve the capacities of West African partners, and, through continuous exchange on methods and results between French, British and African partners, brought closer the concepts and approaches used by anglophone and francophone researchers to analyse strategies for rural development.

The results of these programmes demonstrate the importance of encouraging international exchange and collaboration on rural development themes of common interest and of adopting approaches that permit information and experience to be shared between several African countries. The research programmes also added value by drawing together the expertise and professional experience of two member states of the European Union. By doing so, it is hoped that this will contribute positively to the process of developing a European rural development aid policy that will be able to effectively address the challenges of rural development in Africa.

.....

Ce document est une synthèse des résultats de trois programmes de recherche conjoints franco-britannique Afrique de l'Ouest menés depuis 1996 dans le domaine du développement rural en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre. Chaque programme a été entrepris avec des partenaires de l'Afrique de l'Ouest. Ces programmes ont porté sur les thèmes suivants :

- *Les relations entre la recherche agricole, la vulgarisation et les organisations de producteurs*
- *Les questions foncières et l'accès aux ressources naturelles.*
- *Les politiques du secteur cacao.*

Ces programmes ont permis de mieux comprendre les évolutions récentes en milieu rural africain, à travers des études réalisées par des équipes de chercheurs et praticiens du développement Ouest Africains, Français et Britannique. Ils ont aussi permis d'identifier et d'analyser les nouvelles tendances à prendre en compte dans la formulation des politiques d'aide au développement, d'améliorer les capacités des partenaires Ouest africains et de rapprocher les conceptions des acteurs et chercheurs francophones et anglophones sur les stratégies de développement rural par un échange permanent sur les méthodes de travail et les résultats.

Les résultats de ces programmes témoignent de l'importance d'avoir des échanges internationaux dans des domaines d'intérêts communs et d'adopter des démarches permettant le partage d'information et d'expériences entre plusieurs pays africains. Ils constituent aussi une initiative qui valorise des compétences et des expériences professionnelles de deux pays membres de l'Union européenne et espèrent en cela contribuer à l'élaboration de la politique européenne de coopération au développement rural en mesure de relever les défis du monde rural africain.