



CHAPTER 1

LAND GRABBING

ABBREVIATIONS

AEEP	Africa-Europe Energy Partnership
AU	African Union
CAP	Common Agriculture Policy (in European Union)
CDB	Convention on Diversity of Biology
Ditto	Same source than previous one
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation (of United Nations)
GHG	Greenhouse gases
Ha	Hectares (10,000 square metres)
IMF	International Monetary Fund
REDD Program	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation Program led by UN
UN	United Nations
USA	United States of America
WB	World Bank
WTO	World Trade Organization



VOCABULARY

Agrofuel: name given to fuel produced from agriculture and forestry products (plant, waste biomass). Ex: Jatropha (= Pourghère), palm oil, sugar cane, maize but also rice, cassava, millet, canola, wood etc. This name refers to production techniques. Agrofuels and biofuels are the same. The name 'biofuel' is contested because while 'bio' refers to life while the production practices used threaten the ecosystems life. For that reason the name of 'agrofuels' is preferred. The large-scale cultivation of agrofuels is usually accompanied by intensive use of water, chemicals, fertilizers and pesticides. These practices often result in polluting and depleting water resources and fertile soil, threatening food resources.

Biofuel: fuel produced from plant or biomass. 'Bio' refers to live raw material. Promoters of such fuels argue that these fuels emit much less greenhouse gases than fossil fuels. But in their calculations, the emissions released during production, as a result of land-use change, fertilizer application, drainage of peat soil, processing the fuel and transport of products from field to consumers are not taken into account.

Carbon Credits and Carbon Markets are components of national and international attempts to mitigate the growth in concentrations of greenhouse gases (GHGs). A Carbon Credit is a generic term used for any tradable certificate or permit representing the right to emit one tonne of carbon dioxide or its equivalent. This virtual market allows industry to pollute under tradable conditions without tackling GHG emissions. Carbon market is the trading in Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) emissions and currently makes up the bulk of emissions trading.

Carbon Stock: quantity of carbon contained in a system which has the capacity to accumulate or release carbon such as plant, soil, biomass.

Ecosystem: biological environment consisting of all the organisms living in a particular area and linked together through nutrient cycle and energy flow.

EU Directive: legislative act of the European Union which requires member states to achieve a particular result. The member states have to implement the Directive in their laws.

Food Sovereignty: concept claimed by family farming's movements who require the right of peoples to choose which food to produce and how to produce it according to health and cultural habits and to the protection of environment for future generations. They claim for their right to define their own food system and agriculture systems. These are on the opposite of the food system led by global business that is unsustainable for the environment, as well as for the economy and social aspects. Food Sovereignty prioritises local and national economies and markets. It empowers peasant and family farmer-driven agriculture to guarantee a just income to all people. At the same time, it empowers consumers to control their food and nutrition in a sustainable way.

Food Security: exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food which meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. Household food security is the application of this concept to the family level, with individuals within households as the focus of concern.

Free, Prior and Informed Consent: individual or community has been previously provided sufficient information to form a reasoned decision and is free to give consent.

Greenhouse Gas: gas in the atmosphere that absorbs and emits infrared radiation, contributing to warm climate. This process causes the greenhouse effect. The primary greenhouse gases in the Earth's atmosphere are water vapour, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and ozone. Greenhouse gases greatly affect the temperature of the Earth and play a big role in keeping a temperature where life is possible.

Greenwashing: name done to marketing that promotes the perception that a company's policies or products are environmentally friendly, but are, in fact, unsustainable. This word is modelled on 'whitewashing.'

Impact Assessment: also called 'impact study:' an assessment of the possible positive or negative impact that a proposed project may have on the environment, together consisting of the environmental, social and economic aspects. In the case of land acquisition this should be done by independent consultants in order to try to avoid distorted conclusion.



Right to use: the right of persons to use one piece of land for activities such as: growing, hunting, collecting firewood or medicinal plants, pastoral farming, etc.

Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD): UN program designed to use market/financial incentives in order to reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases from deforestation and forest degradation. Its original objective is to reduce green house gases but it is claimed that it can deliver 'co-benefits' such as biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation. But it has been criticised for ignoring the rights of local peoples, for relying on failing carbon markets for its success, and for depending on uncertain science in setting levels of compensation. It provides economic incentives to rainforest nations to keep their tropical forests intact. But often people living in the forest receive virtually no benefits from the REDD project. What's more some are displaced and their rights are not recognised.

Sustainable: responsible management of resource use that aims at maintaining the biological systems diverse and productive over time, able to meet human needs at present and for generations to come.

Private Property: is the employment, control, ownership, ability to dispose of, and donate land, capital, and other forms of property by persons and privately owned firms. Private property is distinguishable from public, community or government property, which refers to assets owned by a state, community or government.

Privatisation: process of transferring ownership of a business, enterprise, agency, public service or property from the public sector (the state or government) to the private sector (businesses that operate for a private profit) or to private non-profit organizations.

Water Grabbing: involves the diversion of water resources and watersheds by domestic and transnational companies, governments, and individuals, which deprives local communities who depend on the water and ecosystems for their livelihoods. It also can have damaging environmental effects as watersheds are made unsustainable by overuse of limited water. Water grabbing is often linked to land grabbing when great amounts of water are used for agricultural production, or where water is derived or polluted.





CHAPTER 1

LAND GRABBING

1. INTRODUCTION TO LAND GRABBING

The new phenomenon of Land grabbing, or land acquisition in order to produce food or AGRO-fuels for export, is a cause of great concern as it constitutes a serious threat to Food Security and Food Sovereignty in the communities of the countries concerned. Yet in the countries where land is being sold or leased regularly, you find that emergency food relief is often needed there since a immense part of their population live below the poverty line.

Climate Change, water scarcity, high food prices and increasing demand for non-food crops like agro- fuels make the competition for land greater, aggravating the phenomenon of land-grabbing.

Currently Land Grabbing raises a lot of controversy. There is an urgent need to analyse its real nature, and to get a proper, clear and broad understanding of its consequences and implications, so as to take appropriate initiatives at all levels. Objectively speaking, the necessary conditions for land acquisition had been prepared for years by the World Bank Group (WB-G).

Most of these farmland acquisitions are occurring in low-income and middle-income countries, often in settings where land property rights are weak, unclear, and poorly governed – creating very serious risks for the local population and their governments. The phenomenon has taken huge proportions in Africa.

2. WHAT IS LAND GRABBING

Land grabbing is the purchase or lease of vast areas of rural and agricultural land by foreign governments and multinational corporations as well as local rich citizens of holdings for commercial or industrial agricultural production (food, animal feed, agro-fuel, etc.) to be exported to the country of the investor or to the international market. The use of the land is given in exchange of capital, promises of jobs or construction of certain infrastructures. The size of land (in most cases over 10,000ha) is disproportionate in comparison to the average land holding in the region. In many cases the local elites, domestic companies, or wealthy nationals living abroad, are acting as intermediaries: they buy land, to be sold later to foreign investors or for direct exploitation. The fact that locals are acting as intermediaries makes the phenomenon more dangerous.

Investors and governments ignore the people who live on the land from generation to generation that rely on it to survive. Affected communities are not being informed nor consulted, hence, consent is not given which more often than not, leaves them homeless and without land to grow enough food to eat and to make a living. This is why it is called 'land grabs'.

2.1. Factors and Policies Inducing Land Grabbing

Various political and economic policy choices made by specific countries relating to land grabbing have greater impact on other countries even in other continents.

In 2007-2008 the huge increase in the price of agricultural products, like wheat, rice, corn, and other cereals, provoked a serious food crisis. Since then the combination of higher and more volatile global commodity prices, growing demand for agro-fuels, population growth and urbanization, as well as globalization, have renewed the interest in plantation-based agriculture in order to guarantee access to basic food supplies in countries like South Korea, Saudi Arabia, including India and China. In that line, large-scale acquisitions of land to produce food are becoming a priority investment for the future.

Another factor increasing land-grabbing is the big push for agro-fuels for transport, manufactured from crops and materials rich in cellulose. Certain countries (in the EU, USA, and Brazil) have set targets on the use of renewable energy to reduce their dependence on foreign oil and address the climate change. As most of those countries, except Brazil, do not have enough arable land, nor water available to produce them, governments offer financial incentives (subsidies) to their companies and stimulate private investment to produce biomass for agro-fuels overseas. This is a key reason for the boom in the production of agro-fuels in Africa. A negative



factor of agro-fuels is their cultivation may push food prices up threatening the food security of local communities.

In Europe, the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP) promotes food production at low price, thus encouraging investment in big farms in African countries where the costs of land, water and labour are low and so the cost of production is very much reduced. The European Union and many Western countries may have facilitated land acquisitions in Africa through its conditionalities and support to land, investment policies, and trade policy reforms, in collaboration with the WB- G.

Attracted by the availability of what has been described as large portions of 'unutilized fertile land' in Africa, several countries and corporations have secured deals with governments, in an effort to outsource their agriculture, in deals that have been widely contested because of their ambiguous legitimacy.

Some 'land-grab' deals are a new way to meet the food security needs of countries dependent on external markets to feed themselves, while others deals are bluntly exposed for what they really are: business deals and new profit opportunities. 'Farming abroad' is the new strategy to ensure food supply in many food-importing countries, such as Saudi Arabia, Qatar, India, China, South Korea, Japan, Norway, etc, that do not attain enough arable land and water resources to produce their own food. Governments or national companies have decided to produce food, animal feed, agro-fuel in other countries instead of importing them at a higher cost and, sometimes, with export limits established by traditional food-exporting countries. Therefore they target African countries where the needed land and water resources exist and governments are ready to lease arable land to get some investments or financial benefits.

Many of those transactions are done in countries where the law on land is weak. Despite the involvement of food importing states, most of these transactions are between host governments and private corporations. Usually these deals have little oversight and lack transparency regarding issues for instance; amounts paid for land, regulation regarding conditions and monitoring, environmental safeguards and protection of smallholder farmers or traditional communities from losing their customary rights to use land.

International investors are gradually moving away from minerals and oil and focusing on food. The record price of commodities such as wheat and rice reached in 2008 made nations become aware of the importance of secure long-term food supplies. The economic crises have contributed to making land a key commodity (product) to be bought and sold at the best possible price and to be acquired whatever the consequences for its long-term occupants. Farmland has become an ordinary economic and financial asset, replacing other sectors in crisis, such as real estate, hedge funds, etc. Today's investors look at land acquisition as a secure and profitable investment and a new source of income. Majority of the investors have recognized the scarcity of land in the near future and therefore want to increasingly acquire land for the mere purpose of future profits.

Investments in both food and land are new opportunity to harvest great benefits. The main investors on farming land are investment funds such as: pension funds, sovereign wealth and private equity, hedge funds, agro-business, universities, bankers, countries and others. Furthermore, the financial sector interest in arable land is rapidly growing.

For African countries agreeing to such deals, the possible advantages are attractive. Till now African agriculture did not attract significant investments or external aid. The current global economic downturn has made external financing even more scarce. So leasing 'idle' land to foreign governments and companies for large-scale cultivation is often seen like a way to boost the agricultural sector and create new job opportunities. Investors often promise a substantial numbers of jobs for the local population, use of high-tech and high-production farming techniques. In reality both promises are contradictory, as high-tech and high production devices reduce labour. Investors often do not hire significant numbers of people. Based on previous experiences, when they demand unqualified personnel, often they create low-paying jobs and poor working conditions. So the promises relating to jobs and technology do not usually materialize.

The UN, REDD + programs presented as a solution for climate adaptation encourage the acquisition of land (mainly forests) in order to profit from the REDD financial advantages. These initiatives represent an added pressure to the available land resources and encourage land grabbing.



3. CONSEQUENCES OF LAND GRABBING

Since mid 2008, land acquisitions have drawn widespread criticism from United Nations agencies, certain governments, and Civil Society groups concerned that land grabs threaten food security and access to land for the poor and vulnerable populations. The World Watch Institute recently reported that rural populations have been pushed off prime land in 25 sub-Saharan countries for the production of AGRO-fuel crops for foreign nations. The late Peace Nobel Prize, Wangari Maathai, consistently pointed out the devastating impact of big land acquisitions that threatens precious environments, and even more the lives and wellbeing of hundreds of thousands of ordinary people living on these lands. The 2010 World Bank report about large-scale land acquisitions did not find any convincing examples of 'wins' for poor communities or countries, only a long list of losses.

Christine, a farmer in her mid 40s, who lived in Kiboga district (Uganda), said that due to the land grabbing, all their plantations were cut down. "We lost the banana and cassava. We lost everything we had. The company's casual labourers would attack us - they beat and threatened people. Even now they won't let us go back to look for the things we left behind. I was threatened - they told me there were going to beat me if we didn't leave."

Farmers lose their land, and way of life that has been drawn from generations, losing their access to resources such as; areas for farming, grazing, fishing, hunting, gatherings (mushrooms, herbs, nuts, fruits, honey and other foods), collecting firewood and materials for various activities. Without land they are obliged to become daily labourers or tenants if they are lucky, but most of them are forced to migrate into urban areas where they will not find a job, and will have a difficult and marginal life. Women are often those more affected as they are the main food producers (80 per cent in Africa) and have weaker land rights. What is even more painful for local communities is the loss of the land of ancestors and of some spiritual places where they perform traditional ceremonies.

The vast majority of locals receive no compensation. When compensations is provided, it rarely covers the true value of the land and the sources of income and production lost. The compensation received does not allow farmers to survive beyond two years, maximum three years. Corruption plays a role in the unfair compensations.

Land and water are the main resources of family farmers. Land grabbing induces water grabbing too, as industrial agriculture needs huge amounts of the precious liquid. The use of this water by investors, results de facto in the privatization of water, as locals, including those downstream cannot use it. Added to that is the fact that the large irrigation canals, deplete the deep layers of water and may permanently destroy swamps that are crucial for both the region's biodiversity and traditional ways of life.

People are displaced or evicted from their farmland, communal areas and ancestral land often to areas far from public services and infrastructures such as roads, water, schools, health centres, etc. Ultimately the only solution left is to become labourers or to migrate to urban areas as mentioned above.

Land grabbing constitutes a violation of international human rights law through forced evictions, the prevention of meaningful local participation in political decisions that affect their lives, the flagrant denial of information to those affected, the silencing and imprisonment of critics, the introduction of non-sustainable models of land use and agriculture that destroy natural environments and deplete natural resources. Every government is responsible of the respect of human and socio-economic rights of its population and no public policy that disregards them is justifiable by the part of the government, even if presented as public policy or state regulation.

The food sovereignty movement, comprising a network of NGOs, demands the removal of agriculture from the international trade system and rejects agricultural biotechnology and industrial agriculture in favour of localised food production and the protection of rural livelihoods across all nation-states.

Land grabbing threatens the human right to food security and food sovereignty as it makes it increasingly hard for communities and countries to feed themselves. Land grabbing takes vast stretches of lands and ecosystems that were used previously by peasants, local population, hunters, fisher folk and pastoralists for local food production. This, together with the diversion of the food produced at industrial level to foreign countries; jeopardize seriously the right to food and livelihood security of the local population. Added to that is the fact that many countries suffering from food insecurity are leasing or selling their land without mechanisms to ensure that the investments contribute to improved food security. The case of Ethiopia where investors receive numerous incentives to ensure that food production is exported out of the country, in order to get foreign currency, is one of the most striking. The Ethiopian government lists transfer of technology as a major outcome of land investment, even if it has not established any mechanism for such transfers to take

place. The choice of getting foreign exchange at the expense of local food supplies is a political choice.



These unethical foreign land acquisitions have the potential to hurt domestic efforts to raise food production and could limit broad-based economic growth. Land investment may have the potential to help countries work themselves out of poverty but the current rush for land is leaving people worse off. The policy of leasing huge amounts of land works in opposite direction to policies supporting Family Farming that many governments affirm they want to support.

This also puts in danger the urban population who depend on imported food and for whom the volatility of prices may represent a heavy load, as they spend from 50 to 75 per cent of their income on food. For example, in Sierra Leone, nearly half a million hectares of the country farmland had been leased or were under negotiation in 2011 while about half the population remained food insecure.

Large-scale mechanised agriculture often associated with land grabbing is not sustainable, as it uses chemicals that spoil the soil, makes neighbouring lands more vulnerable to contamination, uses large amounts of water depleting groundwater and rivers, harms the environment, destroys the ecosystems, causes the loss of biodiversity, and contributes to climate change from which Africans already suffer.

Total lack of transparency in the way the deals are done. The authorities not only do they not consult those affected by the land deal but even worse those affected are not even informed. There is no respect of the rule of law, no communication or participation of those affected by the deal and agreements have very little demands on the investors regarding social and environmental aspects in order to minimize the negative impacts.

A threat to security. The acquisition of land by foreigners or nationals, have security implications due mainly to the unresolved land question in African states. The loss of control of the territory, land, resources and means of life, relocations and restricted or reduced livelihood opportunities is a potential source of conflicts and a threat to security. Land use and ownership is very important in most African countries and land disputes can become violent and increase due to the growing pressure on land. Unemployed young people are a time bomb.

There are large discrepancies between publicly stated positions, laws, policies and procedures and what is actually happening on the ground. The Ethiopian government insists that for all land deals, consultations are being carried out, no farmers are displaced and the land being granted is 'unused land.' However, communities affirm not to have been consulted, even if each 'investment', as land grabbing is called in Ethiopia, means the loss of some local farmland, and land used for other socio-cultural/ecological activities by the local people prior to land investment.

Being a recent phenomenon, few impact-studies have been undertaken to see the impact of land grabbing on the local population living from this land. These studies need to take into account different levels: social, economic, cultural, environmental, as well as the impact on farmers, development, food security and sovereignty, as well as production. There is need to realize many more studies in different African countries, to see the benefits and losses associated with these land investments, and to fill the information and knowledge gap that actually exists on the phenomenon of land grabbing.

3.1. Land and Water Appropriation

In Africa land grabbing is accompanied by a major 'water grab' which raises serious concerns over the future of freshwater resources when the vast areas of newly acquired land come under cultivation. The volume of water required to cultivate crops on the 40 million hectares of land acquired in Africa in 2009 poses an unsustainable stress on the continent's freshwater supply, when nearly three billion people live in areas where demand for water outstrips supply. Estimates see that 300 to 500 cubic kilometres (km³) of water per year would be used to produce crops on this land, approximately twice the volume of water (184.35 km³) that was used for agriculture in all of Africa in 2005. In the event that the annual rate of land acquisition continues at 2009 levels, demand for fresh water from new land investments alone will overtake the existing supply of renewable fresh water on the continent by 2019. Farmers, pastoralists and fishermen will be the losers. This can jeopardize Africa's fragile river systems.

African governments and international development programs neglect investments in sustainable water management systems, including water harvesting, storage, use of wastewater and small-scale irrigation that would benefit smallholders while managing land and water resources in a durable way. Yet, investing in such systems is the only way forward to effectively address the challenge of food and agriculture on the continent.



Sugarcane, corn, and jatropha grown to produce agro-fuels are some of the thirstiest crops. The cultivation of agro-fuel crops is already having a negative impact on local communities. In Tanzania, a large agro-fuel project operated by the Swedish company EcoEnergy has raised questions about the potential negative impacts the company's sugarcane plantations will have on the Wami River, a source of food and water for many Tanzanians. As long as the surface of land for agro-fuel cultivation in Africa grows, the impact of water extraction in the continent will also grow.

3.2. The Land Deals: Governments and Investors

National governments hold the real power, yet most governments and their bureaucracy are not prepared to handle these complicated processes adequately. Land for these projects is legally acquired in consistency with local land law. The problem is that the local law regarding land ownership and land tenure is often vague, out of date, or does not sufficiently protect the rights of small-holder farmers, particularly women. The majority of these investments are in areas where, there are no land certification processes under way, or where land rights are weak. Most transactions on land acquisition are done between host governments and private corporations.

The land deals must be understood under the investment treaties that protect investments against expropriation. Many African countries have been encouraged to sign these investment treaties in order to open the door to foreign investments. These investment treaties have clauses such as 'national-treatment', 'most-favoured-nation', 'fair and equitable treatment' and 'full protection and security' that protect the investors and make that any unilateral termination of land deal by host governments is considered as an expropriation of the investor's assets that will require payment of compensation.

The host country selling or leasing the land considers the benefits of the deal mainly in the form of employment creation, agricultural development and infrastructure that would come from the investors and will help the economic development of the country. Governments often bet on big producers using labour to work the land instead of small family farmers. The reality is that many of those expectations are very weak in the contracts and often do not come to be realized. They are more "oral promises" than legal obligations.

The conditions of the land deals are very advantageous to the investors while the people affected are not taken into consideration. Government pays little attention to patterns of shifting cultivation, shepherds, or communally used areas, and therefore claims all these lands to be "unused." Land prices offered by governments are often lower than private-to-private deals. In most cases the amount paid by the acquisition of the land is not disclosed. In quite a number of cases the investor does not pay the water consumed, while in others the investor is required to pay an annual water fee, often independent from the quantity of water used. Many investors get tax incentives and pay none or very little taxes. For instance in Ethiopia the profit tax (estimated at US\$ 20 per hectare per year) is usually exempted for a period of 5 years. The exemption of this tax may cost the Ethiopian government about US\$ 60, 2 millions. In Ghana and Sierra Leone land rentals are split among different entities. In the case of Sierra Leone the local landowners get (50%), local government (20%), national government (10%) and administration (20%).

In most cases, contracts are not made public but on the few where studies have been made¹, contracts tend to be short and simple compared to the economic reality of the transaction. Key issues like mechanisms to monitor or enforce compliance with investor commitments, maximizing government revenues and clarifying their distribution, promoting business models that maximize local benefit (such as employment creation and infrastructure development), as well as balancing food security concerns in both home and host countries are dealt with by vague provisions if at all. Often these contracts do not have clauses ensuring the use of local labour. In Mozambique, local opposition to a Chinese project to develop 100,000 hectares was based on plans to import Chinese labour.

The local population who are the most affected is absent from the land deals, because they are not invited to participate. The impact of the deal on the local population is often not even mentioned. Yet more and more farmers and producer associations and community-based organisations are making its voice heard with regard to the negotiation process and the policies regarding land-grabbing.

There is also need to put in place mechanisms to favour transparency in the negotiations and the deals and to monitor the agreement to make sure that the social and environmental safeguards are in place.

¹ Land grab or development opportunity? L. Cottula, S. Vermeulen, R. Leonard, J. Keeley (FAO, IFAD, IIED)
http://www.ifad.org/pub/land/land_grab.pdf



An added problem is that a good number of investors do not have experience on agriculture, while others lack knowledge of farming at that huge scale. This can have terrible consequences for the local people, for the environment and for the future of the area.

4. LAND GRABBING IN AFRICA

Africa has been a particular target for investors searching for land and water. Cheap land and fairly easy access to water make Africa attractive for industrial agriculture as this reap substantial profits for investors. More than 70 percent of the investors' demand for farming land for agricultural production at industrial scale is done in the continent. Investors see Africa as a space of opportunities, with the prospect of accessing abundant water resources which is important in business plans. Some firms are explicit that they are as much agricultural land investors as they are investors in water supplies.

Land grab is not new in Africa as during the colonization, the peoples of Africa were deprived of their own land, forests and mines. During that time vast plantations of tea, coffee, cotton, cacao, spices, peanuts, tobacco, timber and mining activities were developed at the service of the colonial interests. The traditional systems of food production were disrupted or marginalized. After independence African agriculture has been neglected by national governments.

Today after 50 years of independence some African governments are selling big portions of their territories, of their food security and food sovereignty in exchange for money and without almost any obligation in relation to the farmers' communities affected by the land grabbing. Since 2006, more than 30 million hectares of African land have been acquired by investors for projects greater than 1000 hectares. This represents about two and a half times the size of a country like Malawi. Yet in many of the countries where land is being sold emergency food relief is needed regularly and many people live below the poverty line.

4.1. The Extent of the Land Grabbing

Firms involved estimate that US\$25 billion have already been committed globally, and this figure will boast to triple in the near future. While precise details are hard to come by, it is clear that at least 60 million hectares of good agricultural land – enough to feed 50 million families – have been transferred from farmers to foreign entities in more than 20 African countries during the last few years alone, and each day more investors join the rush.

The World Bank reported that, in 2009 alone, deals were announced that concerned some 56 million hectares of large-scale farmland, and that the most attractive countries for such investment were in Sub-Saharan Africa: Sudan, Mozambique, Liberia, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Zambia, DRC, Kenya, Senegal, Mali, etc.

Oxfam "Land and Power Report," reveals that as many as 227 million hectares have been sold, leased or licensed in large-scale land deals since 2001, mostly by international investors. Lack of transparency and the secrecy that surrounds land deals makes it difficult to get exact figures; hence to date up to 1,100 of these deals amounting to 67 million hectares have been cross checked. Half of these deals are in Africa, and cover an area nearly the size of Germany.

Examples of the leases - 99 years at \$1.00 per hectare - are unbelievable deals! But they are only available to a select few. Local farmers - who struggle to feed their families, gain access to fertile land and secure water for both personal consumption and agricultural activity - are not eligible for the deals being promoted in countries where millions of people remain dependent on food aid.

As many as 114 million hectares have been sold, leased or licensed in Africa in large-scale land deals since 2001, mostly by international investors. This covers an area equivalent from Poland to the French border.

Most investors only select land, which has access to water for large-scale irrigation, and that land only has value if water is available. The availability of water gains becomes more important as estimates show that the increased requirements for food to feed the world's population - exceeding 7 billion - will outpace existing water resources by 40 % by 2030. At least 2.5 million hectares of land has already been acquired (in parcels of 1,000 hectares or more) in just five countries: Ethiopia, Ghana, Madagascar, Mali, and Sudan from 2004-2008 (IIED).

Africa needs to learn the lessons from tragedies elsewhere, like the desiccation of the Aral Sea that resulted from similar developments to produce much more cotton, but created far reaching consequences of unimaginable proportions.



4.2. Land Grabbing a Chance or a Curse for Africa?

Foreign companies and investors are attracted to Africa by the abundance of cheap arable land, water and labour. In the last decade the World Bank Group has been working with African governments to open their economies to foreign direct investment (FDI) particularly in agribusiness and tourism. As part of this trend, governments are offering fertile land to investors, often at giveaway prices.

Governments influenced by the World Bank, donors and investors consider big extensions of land as 'idle' and see in the leasing of this land an opportunity to get investments, development and jobs. The reality on the ground is seen differently.

African governments need money for development, infrastructures and services. In countries where there are not many natural resources, the leasing or selling of land is seen as an opportunity to get investments for development, as well as an opportunity for developing modern agriculture. For them it is a 'win-win' story. They get the money for infrastructures and development; farmers get jobs and learn modern agricultural techniques. The reality is quite far from that, as land acquisition is a danger to food security and food sovereignty, as production is in the hands of foreigners. Most of the deals concluded up to now are very meagre regarding the obligations of the investors.

Land in Africa is the fundamental asset for the poor, and both social and economic empowerments are linked to it. Land has a strong economic value because both wealth and survival are tied to the access and control of land. Changes in the patterns of access and control to land have a significant effect on conflict. The relationship of people to land is associated with identity and citizenship. The historical, cultural and symbolic value of land, as a legacy from the ancestors, makes land an important issue that can fuel conflicts. The distribution of land may therefore create a political problem often aggravated by agents of the state who have heavily invested in land.

While many local farmers do not have enough land to feed their family, millions of hectares of good farming land have been transferred from farmers to corporations in the last few years. Each day new investors join the rush for land grabbing. The amount of 'arable' land that is claimed to be available for actual cultivation should first and foremost be allocated to local farmers.

Foreign companies deprive people of land they have used for centuries. There is no consultation with the local population using the land. The deals are done secretly. The only thing the local people see is people coming with lots of tractors to invade their lands. Many governments have the perception that agro-investment is good for development and economic growth yet the grievances of family farmers are many as they are unjustly deprived of the land they were using. Land acquisition by big enterprises may result in numerous potentially negative externalities such as unemployment, environmental problems, and destruction of old social network.

4.3. Land Policies, Land Rights and Land Grabbing in Africa

In most parts of Africa, rural populations depend on access to common property resources (traditional land use) such as fields, pastures, water surfaces and forests for their survival. Securing local rights of access to such resources is key to protecting the livelihoods of local people.

Land ownership is a core issue in the continent. Only a relatively small portion of land in Africa is subject to individual titling. Much land is community-owned, and in some countries state-owned. Even land that is officially categorized as 'under-utilized' is subject to complex patterns of 'customary' usage. At the local level, land rights may be hotly disputed. The local tenure situation may be very complex, involving customary rights.

The co-existence of a multiplicity of legal systems within a state is a product of Africa's history, and the processes around land regulation and reform are challenging. Many countries do not have the means or capacity to develop participatory policy-development strategies, yet the failure to do so can result in land related grievances.

Since independence, African governments have adopted policies and programs aimed at increasing land tenure security for farmers, so as to foster agricultural investment and productivity. These policies have usually been based on systematic registration of land rights, ignoring existing customary and local institutions and largely disregarding the distributive issues underlying tenure security. The 'benefits' have been very limited for the poorer groups, and registration has often served to re-distribute assets towards the wealthier and better-informed. The 'registration' has become a 'privatization' of the land. The outcome has been often the expropriation of the rights of weaker groups and greater ease to acquire land by companies or capital owners. Only a system



that allows for collective registration of community lands that protect 'customary' land rights can be adapted to Africa.

Often title ownership to secure the land doesn't take into account the African customs where the same piece of land may be used by several users: hunters, fishers, collectors of honey, farmers, shepherds, etc. indeed, the title gives all rights to the owner who may sell the land without taking care of the users. The title facilitates the selling of land to foreign investors who have no link with the population surrounding it so they have no interest in taking care of the environment and of future generations. Most business investors see the soil just like a factor of production for money in the short term, which is quite different from the African concept of "the land of the ancestors" that provides food and resources for the enlarged family.

In several African countries, land is nationalized or controlled by the state, like in Ethiopia, Chad, Mozambique, and Tanzania. Most African countries allow private land ownership, acquired through land registrations like in Kenya, Madagascar and Mali. In other countries part of the land belongs to the state, but another part is private: traditional chieftain families, business and individuals. Some countries have introduced private ownership or enabled transfers of 'underdeveloped' state lands, even if the ownership remains with the state. In Mali, Ethiopia, Mozambique most projects are leases for about 10, 30, 50 years, but that go till 99 years in Tanzania.

Investors get land mainly in countries where there is not clear land legislation. Many African countries do not have in place legal or procedural mechanisms to protect local rights and take account of local interests, livelihoods and welfare. Even in the few countries where legal requirements for community consultation are in place, processes to negotiate land access with communities remain unsatisfactory. Lack of transparency and mechanisms for monitoring in contract negotiations enable corruption and make that the deals do not foresee the public interest. Insecure use rights on state-owned land, inaccessible registration procedures, vaguely defined productive use requirements, legislative gaps, and compensation limited to loss of improvements like crops and trees (thus excluding loss of land) all undermine the position of local people.

Often (with the exceptions of Ethiopia and Sudan) the basic data on the size, nature and location of land investments are not accessible through the national land registry or other public sources. Even the countries where there are official 'land banks' available for investment, records may be incomplete, contradictory or not communicated to the relevant district administrations. The local population affected (farmers, shepherds, fishermen, forest dwellers, etc.) are not invited to participate at the negotiations and so are absent from the deals. This lack of transparency facilitates corruption and deals that favour the investor and that are not in the public interest.

Land negotiations are generally done in a very opaque fashion, with negotiations usually conducted secretly between investors, government and private sector officials. The lack of transparency and accountability within the structures, processes and institutions governing land issues allows predatory actors to take advantage of the system.

In the Annex 1 you can find data on the land grabbing in different African countries.

5. THE WORLD BANK A MAJOR PLAYER IN THE PHENOMENON OF LAND GRABBING

In most African countries the 'rush for land' has been well prepared by the World Bank Group, through its investment promotion agencies that focus on helping investors. These agencies have played an essential role in facilitating access to land to investors in developing countries.

Since end of the nineties agencies of the World Bank Group (WB-G), mainly the International Finance Corporation (IFC), the private sector branch of the World Bank Group, and the Foreign Investment Advisory Service (FIAS) have been active in Africa. These agencies have worked as advisors offering technical assistance and advisory services to African governments while imposing their strategies with the pretext of facilitating and attracting investments to the country. African governments have accepted these conditionalities to receive aid from the WB and other donors that channel their aid through the World Bank. In that way the WB-G agencies have promoted policies to facilitate the possibility of foreign investors to acquire land for agriculture in developing country markets.



The Foreign Investment Advisory Service (FIAS) of the WB-G advised in the drafting of bills that it would allow investors greater investment mobility. The benefit provided to foreign investors has facilitated greater interest in African land markets in recent years.

The result of this WB-G strategy has been an increased investor access into land markets. This may seem good for the African countries, unfortunately, it has another hidden face: those investments undermine the well-being of local communities, both in terms of land rights and of access to food. This is a perverse trend as it threatens global food security and livelihoods of small-scale and family farmers.

All throughout Africa the IFC/FIAS of the WB-G have established National Access Leasing Companies to encourage investors to take advantage of acquiring 'idle, available' land. The first of such national companies in Africa was the Ethiopia Access Leasing Company, but since then many others have been established in other African countries with investment from IFC/FIAS. These agencies provide to potential investors information about the 'availability' of land in African countries, outlining the strengths and weaknesses of their investment climates and the relative ease of accessing land to establish export production in the country.

6. FALSE SOLUTIONS

There are some who believe that promoting transparency in land acquisition deals can somehow lead to 'win-win' outcomes. However, even if done 'transparently,' the transfer of large tracts of land, forests, coastal areas and water sources to investors is still going to deprive smallholder farmers, pastoralists, fisher folk and other local communities from crucial, life sustaining resources for generations to come.

A large number of inter-governmental and non-governmental agencies have proposed various sets of principles aimed at making land acquisitions more responsible.

Nor will any set of 'voluntary principles' bring remedy to the violation of the human and socio-economic rights of the population. This is the case of the FAO's "Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of land and other natural resources"²(2010) and the "AU Framework and guidelines for land policy in Africa" (2010). There has been an extensive consultation during the formulation processes, but these documents receive strong criticism due to the fact that they are 'voluntary' and as they are not binding they will have a very limited effect. These frameworks also fail to emphasize the aggravating effect that the escalating number of large-scale land acquisitions have on food sovereignty, food security and on security threads.

The *Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment (RAI) that Respect Rights, Livelihoods and Resources (RAI)*, guidelines for 'responsible investment' done by the World Bank, in association with FAO³, IFAD⁴, UNCTAD⁵, have been done to face the growing opposition to the global land rush. The RAI consist in seven principles that investors may wish to voluntarily subscribe to, when conducting large-scale farmland acquisitions. These guidelines are totally separated from reality and from what is happening in the countries where land is being acquired by investors (either nationals or foreigners). RAI is an attempt to cover up power imbalances so that the land grabbers and state authorities who make the deals can get what they want by calling them 'responsible agro-investment.' In reality they are 'voluntary' rules without any consequence and no obligation. Civil society and human rights groups, smallholder farmer associations and many scientists disagree with the principles. They argue that land-grabbing threatens food security, and human rights to food and land.

In April 2010, some 130 organizations and networks from across the world, including some of the most representative alliances of farmers, pastoralists and fisher folk, denounced the RAI initiative. Their statement debunked RAI as a move to try to legitimize land grabbing and asserted that facilitating the long-term corporate (foreign and domestic) takeover of rural people's farmlands is completely unacceptable no matter which guidelines are followed.

The UN's Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, Olivier de Schutter, publicly criticized RAI for being 'woefully inadequate.' He said, "It is regrettable that, instead of rising to the challenge of developing agriculture in a way that is more socially and environmentally sustainable, we act as if accelerating the destruction of the global peasantry could be accomplished responsibly." Mr. De Schutter

² <http://www.fao.org/nr/tenure/voluntary-guidelines/en/>

³ FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (UN).

⁴ IFAD, International Fund for Agriculture Development, specialized agency of the UN

⁵ UNCTAD, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.



is sceptical that such a code can be negotiated or enforced. He instead emphasizes the existing body of human rights laws, which can be applied to large-scale land acquisitions and used to get governments to meet their obligations to citizens.

7. SMALL VICTORIES OF CIVIL SOCIETY

Some governments, such as Argentina, Brazil and New Zealand, are responding with promises of legislation to stop or put strong conditions on foreigners' abilities to acquire domestic farmland. Others, such as Cambodia, Ethiopia and Ghana, are using legal and brute force to suppress local contestation. In the run-up to the 2012 elections in Mali, the opposition Party for National Renewal has challenged President Touré to disclose all details of land leases amounting to several hundred thousands of irrigated hectares granted in the Office du Niger. In Sudan, the most 'land grabbed' country in Africa, villagers are now rising up against the government in Khartoum for having seized their lands.

During the World Social Forum in Dakar, Senegal, in February 2011, farmers' representatives from Africa, Asia, Europe and the Americas, social movements, organizations of small food producers and other civil society organizations (CSOs) released a collective appeal against land grabbing⁶. Over 650 organizations endorsed it.

When organised in groups or networks connected among them and at international level groups and people are stronger to claim their rights and to call upon the obligation of governments, investors and negotiators. We present some examples of actions endorsed by citizen groups to defend themselves from the consequences of land grabbing, and to demand the respect of rights and law and the participation of the communities affected.

In Ghana (Kpachaa, Northern region), in 2008, RAINS, a local NGO intervened in favour of villagers. Using the legal recourse, RAINS forced BioFuel Africa to stop its operations and to restart the negotiations legally and with all stake holders concerned. Previously, BioFuel Africa, a subsidiary of Biofuel Norway, had acquired 38000 hectares of land owned by villagers. The Agreement had been initially signed with illiterate chief's thumb print without consultation of members of the community. This induced on a loss of land, loss of incomes and of resources from forest. Biofuel Norway started to operate before having got all authorizations required by law in Ghana. It ignored its promises of employment, income and compensation⁷.

In Mali, in 2011, some farmers' organisations joined efforts to retrieve the cropland - subject of unilateral demarcation by the Chinese company COVEC - without informing or including the users of the land. Currently they can cultivate it and they obtained compensation for farmers whose fields had already been affected by the foreign company⁸.

In Senegal, Enda-Pronat took the opportunity of land reform to reinforce and securing women's access to land. Even if national legislation is favourable to women, the practice is quite another. Enda-Pronat demands to integrate land grabbing concerns in the land reform⁹.

In Congo-Brazzaville, in a context of bad governance, the Committee of Justice and Peace of Pointe Noire (Congo-Brazzaville) chose to discuss with the people in charge in the company instead of discussing with the government. They organised visits at the villages for the company and they obtained a partnership with the company to survey the social impact of the investment.

8. LAND GRABBING IS A CHRISTIAN ISSUE

Land is both a socio-economic resource and a source of cultural identity. Therefore, access to land is necessary to human life and to social peace.

The prophets of old as well as Jesus left no doubt about the scandal of land accumulation in the hands of a few. The accumulation of resources, while others lack the necessities of life is in contradiction with the purpose of creation: God created abundance for every human being to enjoy His gifts.

⁶ Dakar appeal against land grab: http://www.aefjn.org/index.php/resources/articles/Dakar_Appeal_against_the_land_grab.html

⁷ Source: <http://ghanabusinessnews.com/2009/05/23/update-any-lessons-for-ghana-in-india%e2%80%99s-jatropha-failure/>; http://www.biofuelwatch.org.uk/files/biofuels_ghana.pdf

⁸ "Mali, Victoire des mouvements sociaux sur l'entreprise chinoise COVEC" <http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/18893>

⁹ « Plaidoyer pour une prise en compte de l'accaparement des terres dans la réforme foncière" <http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/18896>



The Christian Social Ethics is based on clear principles: the universal destination of goods, the common good, solidarity, sustainability, participation and subsidiarity. The socio-economic and cultural rights proclaim the right to the means of life.

AEFJN has a booklet on the “The Ethical and Biblical View on Land Grabbing in Africa” where you can find texts and reflections from the Scriptures, the Catholic Social Teaching, the socio-economic and cultural rights and an invitation to a commitment with those who suffer from land grabbing. You can find it on AEFJN website: Food sovereignty/resources.

9. WHAT CAN BE DONE

Action is required by host governments, investors, aid donors, civil society, and land owners.

Many of the countries where land is being sold or leased are countries that regularly need food aid. The question in these countries should not be to sell land to foreigners but how to make this land ‘available’ to local farmers.

Overall support to family farmers, investing in rural areas and local markets, improving infrastructures, irrigation, soils and seeds. In addition:

- o Support and develop social movements.
- o Asking for a moratorium on land grabbing until policies and regulations are put in place to make sure that local people: participate in the negotiations, are treated fairly, and give their consent before the acquisition of the land.
- o The local population should have consultants to help them in the negotiations to make sure that their social, economic and environmental rights are protected.

9.1. Civil Society

Global action is vital to support the efforts of local people in protecting the little they have, and thus contributing to a future where everyone has enough to eat.

- o Support family farmers in Africa. The support to millions of family farmers in the continent would deliver greater returns than those coming from land acquisition investments. Yet, many of these farmers are being driven off their land. In agriculture, bigger isn’t always better. Small family farms are often more productive than large labour-intensive farms in developing country settings.
- o Work towards securing local land rights.
- o Create awareness and foster training and legal aid programs to help communities understand the challenges and protect their land rights and to represent their interests in dealing with investors and governments.
- o Demand Independent Impact Assessments. Assist governments, local population and farmers to develop expertise in impact assessments.
- o Work for greater government and investor transparency. Promote information sharing on land deals; contribute to the creation and implementation of monitoring systems.
- o Support local communities and governments in monitoring.
- o Empower local communities and involve national parliaments.
- o Strengthen systems that protect land tenure of peasants and small-scale food producers.
- o Legal support to people affected by investment projects. Look for lawyers that will defend them for pro-bona or at low cost. This can help the community to obtain better deals from incoming investors – for instance, through providing land as in-kind contribution to a joint venture in which both investor and community have a stake; or through better compensation regimes and investor-community partnerships.
- o Reclaiming the commons - resources and services that are owned in common or shared among communities and over which people have certain traditional rights - such as common land, clean water, etc. The protection of the commons is necessary for a better distribution of resources and wealth.

9.2. What we can ask Governments for

At the EU

Demand the elimination of policies such as the EU agro-fuels targets, of 10 per cent of fuels from renewable sources by 2020, in



order to curb the rush on land to meet agro-fuel demand. As it is the national governments that subsidize the production of agro-fuels, the demand to eliminate subsidies on agro-fuel production has to be directed to the single national governments of the EU member states.

If subsidies are given to investors for the production of agrofuels in third countries, the EU should demand:

- o Free, prior and full participation and agreement of all local communities concerned — not just their leaders.
- o Protection of the environment, based on thorough impact assessments that demonstrate the project's sustainability.
- o Full transparency, with clear and enforceable obligations for investors, backed by specific sanctions, and measures to protect human, labour and land rights as well as the right to food and development.

In Africa

Demand governments for:

- o Transparency in the deals opening them to public scrutiny to ensure their long-term sustainability. Clarity about the costs and benefits of the business transactions, and the commitment of investors e.g. in terms of numbers and types of jobs, formation, infrastructure and other positive and negative project impacts.
- o Policy reform for greater transparency in decision-making and greater consideration of social and environmental conditions. Mechanisms to discourage purely speculative land acquisitions and to enforce compliance with the conditions contained in contracts.
- o Clear principles, mechanisms and procedures for free, prior and informed consent of the affected local communities.
- o Public debate to clarify the kind of investments the government wants to attract. Strategic thinking is needed. Increased agricultural productivity does not always benefit the population. There is a necessity to balance the conditions of production, the sharing of benefits and the gains for the local population. Make sure that sustainable development is at the centre of investment decision-making. Prioritize projects that work with existing smallholders to increasing agricultural production and providing them with secure, legal rights to land.
- o Enquire about the capacity of investors to manage large-scale agricultural investments effectively.

9.3. Where AEFJN can Intervene?

AEFJN acknowledges and defends the right of small farmers and local communities to cultivate their own land, as an important contribution to food sovereignty. The right to food should always have priority over land investments.

AEFJN lobbies the EU Institutions and Member States in order to protect the access to land, water and seeds for family farmers in Africa, as part of the right to food and food sovereignty.

AEFJN brings concrete situations from Africa to the EU level to underline the necessity to change EU policies that have negative consequences for the living condition of Africans and mainly of small farmers.

AEFJN works for European Union (EU) policies on climate, energy (biofuels), development, agriculture and trade that protect the resources (land, water, seeds) of family farmers in Sub-Saharan Africa.

AEFJN supports African groups working for greater justice and protecting the livelihood of small farmers. When possible, AEFJN works with African groups and AEFJN's antenna in the country where the company concerned is headquartered in the EU. This networking at national and international levels reinforces our voice.

AEFJN sends information on EU policies and on investments influencing land grabbing in Africa to people interested both in Africa and in EU.

AEFJN participates in the international campaign promoting family farming.

AEFJN demands a 5 years moratorium on large land acquisition until impact studies are done and mechanisms to defend the rights of the local population are put in place.



10. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Land policies in Sub-Saharan Africa - The Centre for Land Economy & Rights of Women 2005 <http://www.clearwomen.org/articles/landpolicies-sub-saharanafrica-final.pdf>

Land grab or development opportunity? - Lorenzo Cotula, Sonja Vermeulen, and Rebeca Leonard and James Keeley - <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/011/ak241e/ak241e00.pdf>

11. TOOLS FOR ACTION ON LAND GRABBING

A general introduction on how to carry out an action following the various steps of the Pastoral Circle can be found in the first part of this manual. Below, you will find specific suggestions and tools for an action on land grabbing. These will complement those guidelines found in the section of the Pastoral Circle.

11.1. Knowing the Situation

Go to volume 1 The Pastoral Circle, chapter 3, 4.11 What we need to know about the issue.

Define the problem you want to work at.

When mapping the situation, pay attention to the diverse functions of land and resources on it. People may be directly and indirectly affected by land deprivation.

COLLECTING INFORMATION

Some questions to help you to gather information on the land grabbing and its consequences:

1. How will the production impact on the food sovereignty in the region?
2. How will the wages and working conditions specified in the contract affect people's lives?

Here are some possible questions to know more about the situation.

The deal on land acquisition

- the land acquisitions in your area and the individuals and communities affected.
- how have they been informed, consulted or implicated in the negotiations ? and in the project?
- Which company, government or organisation requests the land? Who are the intermediaries?
- Who are those negotiating the land deal in the name of your government or local authority?
- Is there transparency about the negotiation and the contract?
- Where is the piece of land (to be) taken and what resources were (are) on it?
- Which authorizations, approvals are required for that piece of land to be exploited? Which ministries and agents are involved? Which legislations regarding that exploitation?
- Have impact studies been done? By whom? What are the conclusions? How are they followed?
- What kind of investment is the object of the land acquisition?



- What are the 'obligations' of the investor in in clear terms (jobs, technics, building of infrastructures, etc) and pre-defined sanctions in case of non-compliance? what are the timings?
- Do the contracts provide for clearly defined and legally enforceable compensation for losses incurred by individuals and by communities? Does compensation include commitments related to issues relevant for long-term sustainability of investment such as water, employment, environment etc.?
- Are the wages and working conditions of employees in the project specified in the contract? Are they satisfying enough?

Impact of the land grabbing on the community

- Since when people are affected by the acquisition of the land by investors? How are they affected? What are the resources they are deprived of? What is the impact in their daily life and means of living?
- What will happen if nothing is done against this injustice?
- What is the most serious problem of injustice induced by land grabbing?
- How land issues are integrated in the pastoral work in your region?

Land ownership

- What about the women' right to access to land?
- What is the situation of land ownership and land deals in your country? How is the 'traditional or customary law' respected in the legislation? Does the law on land protect the interests of villagers?
- How do values interfere with people interests: cultural, social (ancestral land), economical (areas for growing, grazing, fishing, hunting, gathering, for collecting firewood and materials for various activities), financial (land as factor of speculation or capitalist investment)?
- How does the government promote the biofuels production, the mining exploitation, the crops for exportation, the food production for citizens, the small farmers?

The company or the investor

- In which country is the parent company? Who are the owners? Who is the director in our country? What is its policy regarding social, environmental aspects? References of its behaviour in other countries and projects where it has been involved.

**To look for information at four levels:**

- 1 **In the village:** women and men using or occupying the land in question, chief and groups:
=> What happens? Who can act? Who may influence the decision? Which contacts do we have?
- 2 **At provincial level:** authorities of administration for land, agriculture, forest, fishing, environment and education (if school in question), employment. Religious authorities.
=> What are your rights and obligations? What are the rights and obligations of the investor?
Identify some other groups facing a similar problem or with similar aims than yours.
=> Who may help us? How? When?
- 3 **At national level:** same questions than at regional level and additionally.
Does the national legislation include some OIT obligations (working conditions), right of local populations, right to food and other rights included in the universal declaration of human rights, right to safe water and sanitation?
Is there a REDD+ program in our region that prohibits villagers to collect wood or to hunt in forest? If yes, who is in charge of this program?
- 4 **At the company:** What are the rights and obligations of the company? which certificates are required to get contracts (environment, permit of exploitation, impact assessment, free, prior and informed consent of population,...).

11.2. Social Analysis of the Situation

Follow the Analysis part in the 1st part of the Manual.

Here are some helping elements to know more about the values and the structures that influence the situation:

- o Look at how traditional or customary rights of use of the land are recognised.
- o What kind of cultural, social and spiritual values interfere with people interests?
- o Look at how rights affect women depriving them from land ownership and influencing their working conditions.
- o Are there policies promoted by your government that affect the situation? E.g. land privatisation, agrofuels promotion and production, encouraging mining exploitation, crops for exportation, supporting or hindering family farming practices, supporting local production, or encouraging import of food; supporting the REDD Program, etc.
- o Have your government signed the "Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests"¹⁰ of the FAO, WB, etc? If it has signed them, how does the government implement them?
- o How the government implements the article 1§2 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights¹¹ that stipulates that no people may be deprived of its own means of subsistence, and the article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on standard of living?¹²
- o How the government implements the requirements on working conditions by the Conventions of the International Labour Organisation Nos 87, 100, 105, 138¹³ if it signed them?

11.3. Christian Reflection on Land grabbing**Bible texts on land tenure**

The prophets of old and Jesus considered land accumulation in the hands of a few a scandal.

The accumulation of resources, while others lack the necessary for life goes against the abundance of creation: God created abundance for every human being to enjoy His gifts.

The powerful who disrespects the dignity and the rights of persons is constantly decried by the prophets. Isaiah proclaims in the face of the rich and the mighty: "Woe to those who join house to house, who add field to field" (Is 5:8) and Micah complains that "they covet fields and seize them" (Mic 2:2).

¹⁰ Adopted in 2012 <http://www.fao.org/nr/tenure/voluntary-guidelines/en/>

¹¹ <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr.htm#part1>

¹² <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml#a25>

¹³ No 87- Convention concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise, No 100- Convention concerning Equal Remuneration of Men and Women Workers for Work of Equal Value, No 105- Convention concerning the Abolition of Forced Labour, No 138- Convention concerning Minimum Age for Admission to Employment. <http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/english/convdisp1.htm>



Jesus condemns the accumulation of riches in the face of poverty and deprivation with unusual sharpness: “Woe to the rich...” (Lk 6:24). He dramatizes the fate of such abuses of creation in the parable of Lazarus and the rich man: “they will have no part in God’s promise.”

The teaching of the Church on land grabbing

The Pontifical Commission for Justice & Peace declared in “Towards a better distribution of land”¹⁴ (§44): “Land occupation is often an expression of an intolerable and morally indefensible state of affairs, and is an alarm bell calling for the implementation of effective and equitable solutions on the social and political level.”

The Church clearly states that land is a common good given by the Creator for the needs of all, now and in the future. The right to use of land is natural and primordial; it is a universal value that applies to every human being and that may not be overridden by any other economic right. The social doctrine of the Church supports private property as a means of achieving autonomy and freedom, a means, however, which is subordinate to the first social function of property: to enable each and every person to live.

Therefore the Pontifical Commission for Justice & Peace (ditto § 32) condemns the latifundia because they “deprive a vast number of people of the right to take part in the process of production through their own labour and to take care of their own needs.” It also condemns (ditto § 34) the “various forms of exploitation of human labour, especially when it is rewarded with wages or other forms of payment that are unworthy of human dignity” and he points to the destruction of the environment through “ways of exploiting the land.”

Finally, the Encyclical letter “Caritas in Veritate”¹⁵ (§ 49) reminds us that the loss of land is an obstacle to development.

The call of Bishops of Africa at the 2nd Synod on Africa

Pope Benedict XVI supports the call of Bishops of Africa by saying in its post-synodal apostolic exhortation ‘Africae Munus’¹⁶ “I call upon the Church in Africa to encourage political leaders to protect such fundamental goods as land and water for the human life of present and future generations and for peace between peoples.”

Effectively, the African Bishops wrote in October 2009: (Proposition 2) “We highly recommend to the Church Family of God in Africa to press our governments to adopt a suitable juridical framework which takes into account the interests of our countries and their populations.”

This is to be put in relation with the Proposition 30 on Land and Water:

Proposition 30 from the SECOND AFRICAN SYNOD on Land and Water

“Since large stretches of fertile land and water resources are unscrupulously exploited by foreign and local investors in many African countries, causing the displacement and dispossession of poor persons and their communities, who are often powerless to oppose this “assault,” this Synod urgently calls upon all governments to ensure that its citizens are protected from the unjust alienation of their land and access to water, which are essential goods of the human person.

The Synod Fathers urge that:

- The Church in Africa seek information and learn about land and water issues in local churches in order to educate the People of God and enable them to challenge unjust decisions in these matters.

¹⁴ Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, “Towards a better distribution of land” (Nov. 1997).

http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/justpeace/documents/rc_pc_justpeace_doc_12011998_distribuzione-terra_en.html

¹⁵ Encyclical letter Caritas in Veritate of the Supreme Pontiff Benedictus XVI to the bishops priest and deacons men and women religious the lay faithful and all people of good will on integral human development in charity and truth (2009). http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate_en.html

¹⁶ Post-synodal apostolic exhortation of his holiness Pope Benedictus XVI to the bishops, clergy, consecrated persons and the lay faithful on the church in Africa in service to reconciliation, justice and peace, November 2011.



- All negotiations on land deals be conducted in full transparency and with the participation of the local communities who may be affected.
- Land alienation deals should not be contracted out nor signed without the free, prior and informed consent of the local communities concerned, nor should people forfeit their land without proper compensation.
- Agricultural workers be guaranteed a fair wage in light of the fact that investments promote the creation of employment.
- Promote the professional formation of youth in farming and the raising of animals as a way to stem the uncontrolled flight from the village to the cities.
- The models of agricultural production respect the environment and not contribute to climate change, soil depletion and the exhaustion of drinkable water reserves.
- Food production for export not endanger food security and sovereignty and the needs of future generations.
- Traditional land rights be respected and recognized by the law.
- Water not be exploited as a private economic commodity without due attention to people's interests."

It would be good to read the previous texts while keeping in mind some questions for deepening the analysis from the Faith point of view such as: What do these mean for our problem of land?



ANNEXE 1: INFORMATION BY COUNTRIES

Information by countries on:

- Civil organisations working against the land grabbing (NGOs, groups).
- Companies implied in land grabbing.
- Documents on legislation or studies.

ANGOLA

COMPANIES

Lonrho (pan-African conglomerate listed in London)

BENIN

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

Réseau JINUKUN, the focal point for « Coalition pour la Protection du Patrimoine Génétique Africain» (COPAGEN) in Benin (06 B. P. 2083 Cotonou).

SYNPA (Synergie Paysanne). <http://synergiepaysanne.org/>

COMPANIES

BETEXCO (Nigeria).

GREEN WAVES (Italy).

DOCUMENT

'Projet de Fourniture des Services d'Énergie' (PFSE) promoted by government (Directorate General for Energy) includes the biomass component with promotion of the local production of bioethanol and biodiesel. http://www.unctad.org/sections/wcmu/docs/ditc_comb_Jatropha012_fr.pdf

BURKINA FASO

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

FASONET (Information on policies' impacts on the agro-pastoral communities). <http://www.lefaso.net/>

INADES (Institut africain pour le développement économique et social), partner of COPAGEN. <http://burkina.inadesfo.net/Notre-Histoire,3.html?lang=fr>

COMPANIES

SN CITEC (B. Faso) local partner of DAGRIS (France).

Total, Suez (France).

CAMEROON

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

ACDIC (Association Citoyenne de Défense des Intérêts Collectifs). <http://www.acdic.net>

PROPAC (Organisations Paysannes d'Afrique Centrale), <http://www.propac.org>

COMPANIES

Socapalm (Cameroon), partner of Groupe Bolloré (France).

DOCUMENT

Complaint at OECD (2010) by Sherpa, CED, FOCARFE and MISEREOR against Bolloré and its partners in Belgium and Luxembourg because of Environmental and labour violations at SOCAPALM in Cameroon. http://oecdwatch.org/cases-fr/Case_200/view?set_language=fr



CHAD

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

CEFOD (Centre d'Etudes et de Formation pour le Développement). <http://www.cefod.org/>

DOCUMENTS

Legislation in Chad: <http://www.cefod.org/spip.php?rubrique6>

Recueil de textes sur le droit foncier au Tchad (Mars 2004) by Banque Tchadienne de Données Juridiques – CEFOD.

CONGO DR

COMPANIES

Aurantia (Spain).

BCI (Banque commerciale Internationale), REDD-Program

Novacel (Belgium), REDD-Program .

Région Bruxelles-Capitale (Belgium), REDD-Program.

Z.T.E. International (China).

DOCUMENTS

Loi portant principes généraux relatifs au secteur agricole en RDC enacted on December 24, 2011 and taking effect by June 24, 2012. The law : <http://lavoixdupaysancongolais.files.wordpress.com/2012/01/rdc-loi-agriculture-principes-fondamentaux-24-12-2011.pdf>

Guide pour la compréhension de la loi agricole par la FOPAC (Fédération des Organisations des Producteurs Agricoles du Congo) et AgriTerra. <http://uploads.agro-info.net/uploads/34/68/39bd51a89f3e4d39e5342d12878cfa17/guidepourlacomprehensiondelaloiaagricole.pdf>

CONGO (BZV)

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

CDJ&P-Pointe-Noire (Commission Diocésaine Justice & Paix), président : Mgr Jean Claude MAKAYA LOEMBA.

RPDH (Rencontre Pour La Paix Et Les Droits de L'Homme). rpdh_pn@yahoo.fr

COMPANIES

Agri SA (government of Brazza).

ENI-Congo, a subsidiary of ENI (Italy).

DOCUMENT

Energy Futures? Eni's investment in tar sands and palm oil in the Congo Basin (2009) by BOELL and many social & environmental NGOs in Congo and in Europe. http://www.boell.de/downloads/091109_Energy_Futures_Congo_Oil.pdf

ETHIOPIA

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

EENGO (Ethiopian environmental NGO). <http://www.eengo.20m.com/>

COMPANIES

Fri El Green Power (Ethiopian Government associated with Italian company).

Flora EcoPower (Ethiopian Government associated with German company) one part is granted to FloraEP and one part is under contract farming with more than 80,000 farmers.

Sun Biofuels (United Kingdom).

DOCUMENT

IFPRI Policy Brief 13. <http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/bp013Table01.pdf>

The Status of Bio-fuels in Ethiopia: Opportunities and Challenges, at workshop on biofuels (2009). http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/04_status_of_biofuels_in_ethiopia_rezene_fessehaie.pdf



GHANA

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

CICOL (Ghanaian Civil Society Coalition on Land) No website, Tel. CEO: 0302-240891.

FoodSPAN (Food Security Policy Advocacy Network), Umbrella of civil society organisations in Ghana.

RAINS (Regional Advisory Information & Network Systems), Partner of African Biodiversity Network (ABN). www.rains.org

COMPANIES

Anuanom Industrial Bio Products Ltd (Ghana).

BioFuelAfrica (subsidiary of BioFuel from Norway).

Government of Ghana + Brazil (for refinery) + financial and trade support of Sweden company (Sekab - Svensk Etanolkemi AB) in Northern tip of Volta Lake.

Jatropha Africa (United Kingdom/Ghana).

ScanFuel Africa Ltd (subsidiary of ScanFuel from Norway) in Northern region.

Also companies from Italy, Germany, Nertherlands.

DOCUMENT

Biofuel land grabbing in Northern Ghana by Vice Chairman of RAINS, Ghana and ABN Steering Committee member, 2008.

http://www.biofuelwatch.org.uk/files/biofuels_ghana.pdf

IVORY COAST

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

Animation Rurale de Korhogo, NGO supported by CCFD.

COMPANIES

21st Century Energy (Ivory coast/USA): public-private partnership.

KENYA

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

ABN (African Biodiversity Network) secretariat based in Kenya. <http://www.africanbiodiversity.org/>

Kenya Land Alliance. <http://www.kenyalandalliance.or.ke/>

Pelum-Kenya (Participatory Ecological Land Use Management). <http://pelum.net/>

COMPANIES

Kenya Jatropha Energy Limited (Italy) for biofuels.

Kenya Biodiesel Association, NGO formed with support from all sectors of the biofuels industry to promote biofuel production.

Bedford Biofuels (Canada) supported by Frank Capital Partners.

DOCUMENTS

Ministry of Energy has developed a biodiesel strategy through its National Biofuels Committee.

National Land Policy: Sessional Paper No. 3 (2009) on National Land Policy.

Sessional Paper, No. 4 (2004) and the Energy Act, No. 12 (2006) to develop bioethanol and biodiesel.

Forest Act 2005.

Unjust Enrichment: The Making of Land Grabbing Millionaires, report (2006) by Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR) and Kenya Land Alliance (KLA).

LIBERIA

COMPANIES

Golden Agri-Veroleum, in collaboration with the Inter-ministerial Concession Committee (IMCC).

Sime Darby in Guthrie.



MADAGASCAR

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

BIMTT (Bureau de Liaison des Institutions de Formation rurale). www.bimtt.mg

CPM (Coalition Paysanne de Madagascar). <http://www.cpm.mg/>

TANY - Collectif pour la défense des terres malgaches (based in France). <http://terresmalgaches.info/>

COMPANIES

Daewoo Logistics (Korea).

GM Biofuels (United Kingdom).

Varun (India) in coastal region, near harbours.

DOCUMENTS

Pour la défense des paysans et des terres malgaches (2009) by Collectif pour la défense des terres malgaches. <http://terresmalgaches.info/spip.php?article30>

TANY Newsletter n° 15 : Demande de transparence sur le projet Daewoo (2012). <http://terresmalgaches.info/spip.php?article44>

MALAWI

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

CISANET - Civil Society Agriculture Network. <http://www.mejn.mw/cisanet.html>

MALI

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS

COPAGEN-Mali.

CNOP (Coordination Nationale des Organisations paysannes). <http://www.cnop-mali.org/>

LJDH - Ligue pour la justice et les Droits de l'homme (Immeuble Madiou Simpara - Route de Koulikoro, Djélibougou – Bamako).

COMPANIES

Malian privates in Niger Delta.

Malibya (join venture of Libyan and Malian governments).

DOCUMENTS

Au Mali, des paysans réclament leurs terres vendues à Kadhafi by D. Thomas in Wordpress, 2011. <http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/18380>

Mali, Victoire des mouvements sociaux sur l'entreprise chinoise COVEC. by Massa Kone - S.G. chargé des relations extérieures Union «UACDDDD» Mali, 2011. <http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/18893>

Loi d'Orientation Agricole (2006): website dedicated to LOA. <http://loa-mali.info>

MOZAMBIQUE

COMPANIES

Sekab (Svensk Etanol kemi AB, Sweden).

Sun Biofuels (United Kingdom) in Manica province.

DOCUMENTS

Jatropha a socio-economic pitfall for Mozambique Report by JU (Justiça ambiental) and UNAC(União nacional de Camponeses).

National Policy and Strategy for Biofuels (March 24, 2009) (guidelines for agrofuels industry).

Mandatory of 15 percent blend of agrofuel to petrol and diesel within five years (2009).

NIGER

COMPANIES

IBS Agro Industries.



NIGERIA

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

ERA/FoEN (Environmental Rights Action/ Friends of the Earth – Nigeria). www.eraaction.org

COMPANIES

T4M. (Trans4mation Agric-tech) (United Kingdom) <http://euobserver.com/9/28113/?rk=1>

LEGISLATION

National Food Security Programme (NFSP)(2008) by the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources.
New agricultural policy on agriculture (2001).

SENEGAL

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

ENDA-PRONAT. <http://www.enda.sn/equipies.htm> <http://www.endapronat.org/>
CNCR (Conseil National de Concertation et de Coopération des Ruraux). <http://www.cncr.org/>

COMPANIES

Conseil Rural de Mbane attributed 233 000 ha to Belgium and United Kingdom interests.

DOCUMENTS

LOASP Loi d’Orientation Agro-Sylvo-Pastorale (2004).
Plaidoyer pour une prise en compte de l’accapement des terres dans la réforme foncière by OID/ESF Agence de Presse Sénégalaise, 2011. <http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/18896>

SIERRA LEONE

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

Green Scenery. <http://www.greenscenery.org/>

COMPANIES

Addax Bioenergy (Switzerland).
Socfin (Belgium).

DOCUMENT

Oakland Institute report, 2011. www.oaklandinstitute.org

SOUTH AFRICA

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

EJN (Economic Justice Network) on Food & Justice. <http://www.ejn.org.za/>
PLAAS (Institute for Poverty, Land & Agrarian Studies). <http://www.plaas.org.za/>

SUDAN

COMPANIES

Abu Dhabi (United Arab Emirates) in Nile region.

TANZANIA

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

INADES (Institut africain pour le développement économique et social). <http://www.inadesfo.net/Welcome.html>

COMPANIES

Bioenergy Tanzania Ltd (associated with SEKAB, Swedish company).
CAMS Group (United Kingdom).
D1 Oils (UK) Felisa (Tanzania-Belgium company), NGO with government.
Group UK-USA-Malaysia, funds from USA.
Prokon (German company).
SEKAB Bioenergy Tanzania Ltd (a major SWEDISH bioethanol producer).
Sun Biofuels (United Kingdom).



A joint venture of Malaysia and Indonesia signed exploitation for 30 years in Kigoma.

DOCUMENTS

Agriculture and Livestock Policy (1997).

Biofuels Task Force, Water policy (2002).

Environmental Management Act (2004).

Environmental Policy (1997).

Livestock Policy (2006).

National Environmental Impact Assessment Audit Regulation (2005).

Water Management (control & Use) Act, Food Security Act (2001).

AGROfuels in Africa – The impacts on land, food and forests - Case Studies from Benin, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia by African Biodiversity Network. http://www.biofuelwatch.org.uk/docs/ABN_Agro.pdf

Biofuels and neo-colonialism, by Professors in Tanzania. https://docs.google.com/Doc?id=ac5dcsf2q6km_304f2mc4fd4

Biofuels, land access and rural livelihoods in Tanzania, IIED study. <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/12560IIED.pdf>

TOGO

CIVIL ORGANISATION INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

MAPTO (Mouvement pour une alliance paysanne au Togo).

UGANDA

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

ABN (African Biodiversity Network). <http://www.africanbiodiversity.org/>

HOCADAO (Hoima Caritas Development Organisation). <http://www.hocadeo.org/>

UBN (Uganda Biodiversity Network), P.O. BOX 19098, Kasangati, Uganda.

Pelum (Participatory Ecological Land Use Management). www.pelumuganda.org

COMPANIES

API (African Power Initiative) takes profit from Carbon credit and agrofuels promotion by national government to produce oil from Jatropa.

Kaweri coffee plantation Ltd. and Mubende Coffee plantation, local partners of Neumann Kaffee Gruppe, (Germany).

DOCUMENT

Uganda's Renewable Energy Policy: supports to blend 20% biofuels into all gasoline fuels and diesel. It includes Regulatory Framework, many Tax Incentives, Standards, Handling/Storage, Pricing, Blending Facilities for ethanol and blended fuel products and Environmental Aspects of ethanol projects <http://www.rea.or.ug/userfiles/RENEWABLE%20ENERGY%20POLIC9-11-07.pdf>

ZAMBIA

COMPANIES

D1 Oils (United Kingdom), also working by contracts signing with farmers, as well as through NGOs.

DOCUMENT

Institutional, administrative, and management aspects of land tenure in Zambia.

<http://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstream/handle/10535/7622/Institutional,%20administrative,%20and%20management%20aspects%20of%20land%20tenure%20in%20Zambia.pdf?sequence=1>

ZIMBABWE

CIVIL ORGANISATIONS INTERSTING IN LAND GRABBING

CCJPZ (Catholic Commission for Justice & Peace in Zimbabwe), isccjpz@telco.co.zw

Pelum-Zimbabwe (Participatory Ecological Land Use Management), <http://www.pelumrd.org/index.php/country-profiles/Zimbabwe>.

COMPANIES

2200 Zimbabweans acquired the most fertile farming regions.

National Oil Company of Zimbabwe (in partnership with Green Fuel).



ANNEXE 2: INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS IN RELATION WITH LAND ISSUE

African organisations with national groups:

ABN (African Biodiversity Network) Lobbying regionally and internationally for policies in favour of the rural communities with partners in: BENIN, BOTSWANA, ETHIOPIA, GHANA, KENYA, MOZAMBIQUE, ZIMBABWE, SOUTH AFRICA, TANZANIA, TOGO, UGANDA AND ZAMBIA. The ABN Secretariat is based in Kenya. <http://www.africanbiodiversity.org/>

ANoF (African Network for Food) / Réseau Africain Pour l'Alimentation (RAPDA), there is a regional Sub coordinator for Eastern and Southern African, www.rapda.org

AFSA (Alliance for Food Sovereignty in Africa) is a network of African organisations to lobby policy makers on food sovereignty issues and to promote sustainable farming practices. AFSA represents small-scale farmers, pastoralists, hunter-gatherers, indigenous peoples, citizens and environmentalists from Africa.

The members are: African Biodiversity Network (ABN); African Centre for Biosafety (ACB); Community Knowledge Service (CKS); Comparing and Supporting Endogenous Development (COMPAS); Coalition for the Protection of African Genetic Heritage (COPAGEN); Eastern and Southern African small scale Farmers' Forum (ESAFF); Friends of Earth Africa; GRAIN ; Indigenous peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee (IPACC); Participatory Ecological Land Use Management (PELUM) Association; PROPAC; ROPPA; La Via Campesina Africa/ UNAC; Women for Change; World Neighbours.

COPAGEN (Coalition pour la protection du Patrimoine Génétique Africain) MALI, NIGER, IVORY COAST, BURKINA FASO, BENIN, TOGO, Contact members: Jinukun-copagen (Benin), Pronat (Senegal), INADES (BFaso, Togo).

HUB RURAL (West Africa level). <http://www.hubrural.org/>

INADES (Institut africain pour le développement économique et social) Education and training for social and economic improvement of people, B. FASO, BURUNDI, CAMEROON, CHAD, IVORY COAST, DR CONGO, KENYA, TANZANIA, TOGO. The headquarter is in Abidjan. <http://www.inadesfo.net>

PELUM (Participatory Ecological Land Use Management) Representing small scale farmers in KENYA, UGANDA, TANZANIA, RWANDA, MALAWI, ZAMBIA, ZIMBABWE, SOUTH AFRICA, LESOTHO, AND BOTSWANA. www.pelum.org

ROPPA (Réseau des Organisations Paysannes et des Producteurs Agricoles de l'Afrique de l'Ouest). <http://www.roppa.info>

WORLD ORGANISATIONS:

Civil Society organisations:

CCFD-TerreSolidaire (comité contre la faim et pour le développement). <http://ccfd-terresolidaire.org/>

EAA (Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance). <http://www.e-alliance.ch>

Family Farming Campaign for IYFF (International Year of Family Farming) in 2014 Family Farming Campaign .

FIAN (Foodfirst Information and Action Network): international NGO Supporting the struggle for the Human Right to adequate food. www.fian.org

Misereor: German Christian NGO that runs partnership and advocacy. www.misereor.org

Trocaire. <http://www.trocaire.org/>

Wetlands International (environmental NGO dedicated to wetlands). <http://www.wetlands.org/>

World Rainforest Movement. www.wrm.org.uy

World Rural Forum. <http://www.ruralforum.net/>

Institutions:

EU delegations in Africa: List on http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/repdel/edelhrm/index.cfm Choose the country in box "Delegation"
OECD: Complaints for non compliance of the EU companies with ILO (International Labour Organisation) principles and OECD principles can be addressed to the OECD Investment Committee. www.oecd.org

UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to food at Human Rights Council and UN General Assembly (3rd committee) <http://www.srfood.org>
Complaints for non compliance with the right to food is to be addressed to the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to food.



ANNEXE 3: DOCUMENTS ON LAND, WATER, RIGHT TO FOOD AND LAND CONTRACTS

Access to land and the right to food, Report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the right to food (2010)
http://www.srfood.org/images/stories/pdf/officialreports/20101021_access-to-land-report_en.pdf

Article 11 of International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights (1994).
<http://www.hrweb.org/legal/escr.html>

Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizing the right to a standard of living including food and housing.
<http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/>

Dakar Appeal against Land Grabbing (2011).
http://www.aefjn.org/index.php/resources/articles/Dakar_Appeal_against_the_land_grab.html

Framework and guidelines on land policy in Africa by Africa Union, African Development Bank and Economic Commission for Africa (2010). <http://www.au.int/fr/dp/rea/content/framework-and-guidelines-land-policy-africa>

Impacts of some EU companies involved in large piece of land acquisition for biofuels investment in African countries (2011) Report based on studies selected by AEFJN.
<http://www.aefjn.org/index.php/resources/articles/impacts-of-some-eu-companies-involved-in-large-piece-of-land-acquisition-for-biofuels-investment-in-african-countries.html>

Jatropha Reality Check, A field assessment of the agronomic and economic viability of Jatropha and other oilseed crops in Kenya, study directed by German Technical Cooperation. <http://www.worldagroforestry.org/downloads/publications/PDFS/B16599.PDF>

Land – Biblical and ethical dimensions - Deepening of Christian social ethical reflection (2011), by Schonecke Wolfgang, AEFJN-Germany. www.aefjn.org; <http://www.netzwerkafrika.de>

Land Grabbing by Foreign Investors in Developing Countries: Risks and Opportunities, author: J. von Braun and R. Meinzen-Dick (2009), collection IFPRI Policy Brief 13.
<http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/bp013Table01.pdf>

Large-scale land acquisitions and leases: a set of minimum principles and measures to address the human rights challenge; Report presented to the Human Rights Council [A/HRC/13/33/Add.2] (March 5, 2010).
http://www.srfood.org/images/stories/pdf/officialreports/20100305_a-hrc-13-33-add2_land-principles_en.pdf

M'bour Declaration on Land Grabbing (2011) at workshop on land grabbing, by Christian groups and other groups involved in land issue. <http://www.aefjn.org/index.php/info-345/articles/aefjn-at-wsf-2011-declaration-on-land-grabbing.html>

Resolution of the UN general Assembly recognizing access to clean water and sanitation as human right essential to the full enjoyment of life and all other human rights (2010) (A/64/L.63/Rev.1). <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/LTD/N10/464/64/PDF/N1046464.pdf?OpenElement>

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/drip.html>

Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests: text, process, studies and reports of consultation. <http://www.fao.org/nr/tenure/voluntary-guidelines/en/>

Voluntary Guidelines on Land Tenure. http://www.fao.org/nr/tenure/lt-home/en/?no_cache=1

ANNEXE 4: WEBSITES FOR INFORMATION RELATIVE TO LAND GRABBING

aGter: land and water documents. www.aGter.org

Farmland: information relative to food crisis and the global land grabbing. <http://farmlandgrab.org>

Grain: documents related to land and food sovereignty. <http://www.grain.org/front/>

ILC: International Land Coalition. <http://www.landcoalition.org>

Inter-Réseaux Développement rural. <http://inter-reseaux.org>

La Via Campesina – International Peasants Movement. <http://viacampesina.org/en/>

Mokoro. <http://www.mokoro.co.uk/land-rights-in-africa>

Oakland Institute research and analysis on land grabbing. <http://media.oaklandinstitute.org/>

Stop Africa Land Grab. <http://www.stopafricalandgrab.com/>

ANNEXE 5: SOME POLICIES AND AGREEMENTS AFFECTING LAND

African only:

Common energy policy (CEP) promotes ethanol-biodiesel in West Africa.

Regional Biomass Energy Program (PRBE) led by the Economic and Monetary Union of West Africa (UEMOA).

Since 2006, UEMOA and FAGAS (African Fund for Guarantee and Finance) are involved in the promotion and development of the sector agrofuel in West Africa.

Association of African biofuel producers (AAPB) gathers private operators. AAPB aims to promote the production and marketing of biofuels in Africa.

Others:

Africa-EU Energy Partnership (AEEP). <http://www.aEEP-conference.org/en/documents>

Agrofuel promotion in EU as renewable energy: DIRECTIVE 2009/28/EC
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:140:0016:0062:en:PDF>

Climate policy: leads to program such as United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest. (REDD) <http://www.un-redd.org/>

Partnership on Bioenergy between Mozambique, UE and Brazil (=Co-operation for energy).
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/er/115812.pdf