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Food security defined

“When all people at all times have both physical and economic access to sufficient food to meet their dietary needs for a productive and healthy life.”

- Is adequate food available?
- Do people have access to food?
- Knowledge of basic nutrition and access to complementary resources?
How land tenure impacts food security…

- Tenure rules/norms impact access
  - To land, water, pastures, forests

- Tenure rules/norms impact productivity/availability
  - By creating incentives

- Tenure rules/norms can impact poverty
  - By creating/limiting economic opportunities
It’s not just about inputs, institutions matter

Food security is intimately tied to the institutional environment, land governance systems are part of that environment.

– If these systems are weak access/productivity/poverty alleviation are negatively impacted
– Smallholders may, or may not, have tenure security
– Legal pluralism can compound problems
– As does lack of capacity
Linkages between land tenure and other sectors can affect food security: examples from Africa

Competition over farmland in the Senegal River Valley

• Modified physical landscape (dams in late-1980s) contribute to decrease in traditional agricultural practices and productivity (flood recession agriculture)
• Irrigated agricultural production requires greater investment placing some smallholders and historically disadvantaged groups at a disadvantage
• Land tenure policy and land access rules have been imperfectly applied
Linkages between land tenure and other sectors can affect food security: examples from Africa (2)

Population growth in rural Burundi
  • Growth rate over 3% annually
  • Attachment to land and resistance to large-scale migration to cities
  • Traditional inheritance rules are tenaciously applied in rural areas leading to increasingly tiny parcels available to support food needs of young families
Linkages between land tenure and other sectors can affect food security: examples from Africa (3)

• Conflict – sometimes violent - over land use in many areas of the Sahel
  - Agriculture versus livestock
  - Industrial scale production of cash crops versus small-holder production

• Artisanal diamond mining in Liberia
  - Some artisanal diamond mining zones have greatly reduced local production of food crops as a result of conversion of arable land to mines.
  - Local populations have come to depend on expensive imported food.
Linkages between land tenure and other sectors can affect food security: examples from Africa (4)

- Weak enforcement of forest and environmental codes in several Sahelian countries
  - Clearing of trees in protected areas to make way for agricultural production
  - Potential increase in CO2 emissions that may in turn contribute to climate change and quality of arable land
Women face particular constraints

- Substantial gender asset gaps persist
- Unique role producing food; unique role supporting families
- Improving access to land (credit, inputs) can have powerful, positive impact
- Working with & within customary systems, with men & boys is critical
Other important considerations

- Sometimes customary systems are secure enough
- Private sector investors can bring benefits, but they (and you) need to understand tenure risks
- Land rights violations may be new human rights frontier
- Communities can partner with investors, resource rights can be their assets
- Participatory processes need to be strengthened
An example from Senegal

Promoting agricultural investment in the Senegal River Valley
- Integrated Water Resources Management Project
- Land Tenure Security Activity

*Financed by Millennium Challenge Corporation*
Some prominent characteristics of Senegal River Valley:

• A longstanding magnet for development of irrigated agriculture
• A mix of statutory and customary systems and rules:
  - Customary land tenure systems vary significantly by site
  - Local governments have long-standing statutory authority to manage land tenure
• A history of land conflict

Principal IWRM Project Activities

Delta:
• Renovate infrastructure to improve quality and quantity of water for existing perimeters (over 30,000 ha)
• Expand water availability to adjacent areas (over 6,000 ha)

Podor:
• Construct new irrigation perimeter (450 ha)
The Land Tenure Security Activity is a component of IWRM

LTSA hypothesis and justification:
Increased value of land and water resources could intensify competition over land and thus risk of land conflict. This in turn puts at risk goal of increased agricultural productivity

LTSA is designed to:
• Secure land tenure rights in IWRM intervention areas by:
  - Increasing capacity of local governments to apply existing legislation and tools
  - Regularizing and formalizing existing legitimate land property rights (whether customary or statutory)
  - Allocating land efficiently, transparently – and with local participation
LTSA calendar, budget and program highlights

- Overall Compact calendar:
  - 5 years from September 2010 to September 2015
- Divided into 2 phases:
  - Phase 1: Baseline studies
    - 2011/2012 (approximately 2 years)
    - $2.7m
  - Phase 1 highlights:
    - Completion of exhaustive land property rights inventory covering approximately 58,000 ha
    - Participatory development of land allocation criteria by each of 9 local communities
  - Phase 2: Program implementation
    - 2013-2015 (approximately 3 years)
    - $3.8m
  - Phase 2 highlight:
    - Land allocation of 450 ha Ngallenka irrigation perimeter in respect of land allocation criteria developed during LTSA Phase 1
LTSA Phase I (2010-2012)

• Answering key questions:
  - When land is identified for a project, ask who traditionally has been living on & using these resources (land, water, pastures, forests)
  - Which rights have groups & individuals traditionally held?
  - Are these rights recognized? Formalized?
  - If not, how will local actors be affected by project?
  - If so, are they adequately enforced?

• Participatory development of locally-specific land allocation criteria
LTSA Phase I (2011-2012):
Land property rights surveys

- Quantitative and qualitative property rights surveys
- Collection of GPS points and mapping of all land surveyed
- Establishment of GIS property rights database supported by satellite imagery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE</th>
<th>PERSONNES (physiques et morales)</th>
<th>PARCELLES/UNITES DE MISE EN VALEUR</th>
<th>SUPERFICIE (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Podor</td>
<td>3.132</td>
<td>10.163</td>
<td>20.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>3.127</td>
<td>5.083</td>
<td>37.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6.259</td>
<td>15.246</td>
<td>57.978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LTSA Phase 2: 2013-2015

Activities:

• Formalization of land rights identified during Phase 1
• Capacity building of local land governance institutions
• Development and deployment of land allocation manuals, information management systems and mechanisms for technical support to land allocation operations

Outcome:

• Clear and secure land rights along with procedural clarity set the stage for defined, transparent approach to land allocation
• Exchanges with potential private and public investors in irrigated agriculture in the SRV reflect local consensus
Summary of LTSA Highlights

• Exhaustive compilation of baseline land tenure situation including land property rights inventory and identification and analysis of statutory and customary land rights
• Participatory development of land allocation criteria
• Support for application of existing policies and tools (land allocation by local governments, legally mandated land use planning instrument (POAS))
• Leveraging opportunities to increase or secure access to land and natural resources for vulnerable groups (women, project affected farmers, transhumant herders)
• A conservative implementation calendar to allow for underestimation of time needs (land property rights inventories can take time!)
Transparent and efficient land tenure management can:

- Secure rights and increase or create incentives to invest or conserve
- Increase productivity
- Improve or expand market opportunities
- Create opportunities for employment creation
- Improve resilience and reduce vulnerability to food insecurity
To learn more

  [http://www.fao.org/docrep/005/y4671e/y4671e06.htm](http://www.fao.org/docrep/005/y4671e/y4671e06.htm)

  [http://usaidlandtenure.net/sites/default/files/USAID_Land_Tenure_Food_Security_and_Tenure_Issue_Brief_1.pdf](http://usaidlandtenure.net/sites/default/files/USAID_Land_Tenure_Food_Security_and_Tenure_Issue_Brief_1.pdf)

- *Declaration of the World Summit on Food Security*, Rome, 16-18 November 2009  
QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

• What are some of the constraints to addressing land governance issues in food security projects?
• How has land governance been addressed in food security projects with which you’ve been associated or that you know of? How could/should land governance issues have been addressed?
• Why is negotiation often a characteristic of successful land allocation? What is the basis for negotiations? What are the necessary ingredients for successful negotiations?
Discussion Questions

• Question 1: What are the key tenure aspects to be appraised and addressed in projects focusing on food security? How can they be addressed?

• Question 2: Do you see potential challenges in integrating environmental protection in food security programming? If so, what are they? How can they be addressed?