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Objectives

- Increasing awareness on the importance of addressing NR (land/forest) issues in view of improving food security
- Illustrating a way forward for addressing these issues in the context of policy formulation/implementation processes

This will be done by:

- Highlighting the evolution of the approach(es) followed by FAO technical unit(s) (WHERE DO WE COME FROM?)
- The basics of our field intervention(s) today (WHERE WE ARE) with some highlights on case studies (Mozambique, Ethiopia)
- Ways forward: WHERE ARE WE GOING? (issues to be addressed, how, with own)
Where do we come from?

Since 1946 links between Food Security and Land where clear. However, during several decades the tendency has been to work with a sectorial perspective.

Land issues have been quite prominent in FAO agenda in the 50th, but have shown a decreased importance from the 60th on.

Only in 1979 situation (temporarily) reverted with a first World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (WCARRD).

The 80th, dominated by neo-liberal approach, have shown very limited concrete actions, and land tended to disappear from FAO agenda.
Where do we come from?

Beginning of the 90s a request was put forward to eliminate the Agrarian reform unit of FAO (analogy with Fukuyama: End of History – End of Agrarian Reform importance)

However, breakdown on Berlin wall and disappearance of URSS opened the way for more and more countries to admit they had land related problems.

De facto this has been the starting point of our (renewed) internal thinking.
Agrarian reforms/land tenure systems being viewed as the result of historical and social processes. The analytical angle being **People** who defines the space they live in.
Where we are

Land Tenure defined as a “bundle of rights”: this pushed towards a convergent on the issues of

**LEGALITY AND LEGITIMACY**

Access to land being seen as part of overarching Agrarian Systems: more attention to be paid to the

**FAMILY FARMING** sector

**GENDER** considerations

**LAND MANAGEMENT**
Where we are

- Reconsidering the role of the State and State’s institutions
- Increasing space occupied by NGOs/CSOs
- Back to basics: searching links with FAO Food Security units
- Need to move beyond an “agricultural” view of the space: search for acquaintances with FORESTRY Dept.
Where we are

The International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD) March 2006, Porto Alegre, Brazil

"I have publicly denounced hunger as a curse devised by men against other men."
Josué de Castro
Where we are

Land problems are to be dealt through:

- A system vision: TERRITORIES
- Access and management of NR – no longer “land” alone
- Historical/social products: NEED FOR DIALOGUE AND NEGOTIATION
- Widening the (land) agenda: ENVIRONMENT, INDIGENOUS PEOPLE
- Not just PARTICIPATION but INCLUSIVENESS
- Need to address POWER RELATIONS and ASYMMETRIES
The importance of VG on Right to Food for the success of ICARRD

Link between FS and access to land clearly underlined

Process of preparing has fully involved CSOs/NGOs: highly appreciated by them

This has strongly contributed to a climate of good will between FAO and CSOs/NGOs on all policy discussions concerning ICARRD agenda and final declaration
Where we are going

Mozambique’s experience: toward a convergent path
Case study: Mozambique

COMMUNITY REVEALED BY FARM SYSTEM ANALYSIS: RAINFED MIXED AGRICULTURE AND LIVESTOCK, SEMI-HUMID TROPICS, WITH SEASONAL RAINFALL FILLING RIVERS

Source: Christopher Tanner: Fieldwork in Mozambique, Angola, Guinea Bissau
COMMUNITY REVEALED BY FARM SYSTEM ANALYSIS: LONG RANGE PASTORAL SYSTEM, MIXED AGRICULTURE AND LIVESTOCK USING FLOOD PLAIN, SEASONAL RIVER, AND SMALL RAISED AREAS

Family plots, as waters recede

Corals for cattle during rains (rangeland flooded)

PRODUCTION SYSTEM LIMITS

DRY SEASON RANGELANDS

Distances of tens, even hundreds of kilometres

Long distance grazing, near dry season river beds and surrounding areas
Case study: Mozambique

Diagrams 1 and 2 illustrate how rural households in these kinds of situation need far more land than the immediately visible family plots of one or two hectares.

External threats: need to better secure those “territorial” rights

The PARTICIPATORY LAND DELIMITATION approach


Land Law (1997)

Forest law and Regulation of Land Law (1998)


Field experiences and trainings (1997-2009)

Territorial Planning Law

Rural Development Strategy
Mozambique: Why is it important for this learning programme?

Internal convergence towards a really integrated approach: NRL/LEGN/FOR (collaboration is increasing with ESW and on Food Security issues)

Possible to address POWER RELATIONS/ASYMMETRIES through an empowering bottom-up approach

To do this, a strong collaboration has been built with FAO Office, fundamental for the overall program to move on
Where we are going

Ethiopia: an example of this convergent path
Where are we going?

Lessons learned and prospects for future work:

- Conflicts are usually natural resources based. FAO HAS to be present there.
  (increased collaboration with Emergency Unit: Angola, Sudan, Ethiopia, Haiti ..): increased tenure security is fundamental for overall FS.

- Addressing power relations is essential: crisis of legitimacy of many State institutions – lack of trust between actors - who to deal with it?

- Creating space for weaker actors to actively participate in policy dialogue.

- Continuously adapting tools/proposals to local problems and realities (opposite to one solution fits all); more attention to PROCESSES rather than only on RESULTS (MODESTY – DOUBTS).

- Role of FAO as Facilitator of dialogue, an increasingly important role in development contexts (PLD, PNTD).

- Increasing work with Indigenous People (territorial delimitations).
Further readings

- Kapuściński R. 2007. Encountering the Other: The Challenge for the Twenty-First Century
- FAO. 2006. Participatory land delimitation Experiences and methodologies. CD-Rom
- FAO. 2005. An approach to rural development: Participatory and Negotiated Territorial Development (PNTD), Rome, Italy
- FAO. 2004. Participatory Land Use Development in the Municipalities of Bosnia and Herzegovina
- De Castro J. 1946. Geography of Hunger
**Links to related sites:**

- International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD) [www.icarrd.org](http://www.icarrd.org)
- Land Tenure.info Basic Elements on Land Tenure Systems [www.landtenure.info](http://www.landtenure.info)
- Inventory of the post war situation of land resources in Bosnia and Herzegovina [http://www.plud.ba/](http://www.plud.ba/)
[Slide 4]: Brief reconstruction of NRLA historical changes. In parallel the Land Management group (previously known as Soil Resources, Management and Conservation Service) has historically been inspired by an agronomic view, soil oriented, as the basic determinants of the policies/programmes to be implemented to stimulate local development. The “basic” text produced has been Land Use Planning, http://www.fao.org/docrep/T0715E/T0715E00.htm quotation: “Land-use planning is the systematic assessment of land and water potential, alternatives for land use and economic and social conditions in order to select and adopt the best land-use options”.

Return to slide 4
[Slide 7]: Little by little a convergence path has started, putting at the centre of the attention the People who defines the space they live in. Although this “space” is partially an independent variable, for sure it also depends on Humans actions to change and adapt it for human purposes. Therefore here is where the long way to put Human first did started. In the case of Agrarian Reform processes, the main change has been to link the AR settlements with the local (micro-regional) environment, usually composed by Family Farmers, similar to the AR beneficiaries. As a result, little by little instead of talking about the viability of new AR Settlementes, we have started introducing the concept (overarching) of Family Farming viability (typical case is Brazil). There were also tactical reasons for that: AR is more linked to left parties, whilst FF is a more neutral approach, a wider one, allowing wider political alliances. This internal thinking (putting Human first) has been instrumental when we started revising our field practices in Africa, particularly in post conflict situations. The central point then became the recognition that local communities have been living in their areas since historical times, well before the concept of modern State has been invented. Communities at the centre means recognizing them a legitimacy (social, political and economic one) that no governments were interested giving them (before and after Independence). This is where the concept of Encountering the Other (Ryszard Kapuscinski )takes its deep roots. Local communities are historical institutions, not only on Tenure issues but even more on Management issues. They know their land, the actors, and have developed concrete tools to solve their problems and conflicts. The recognition of their role is therefore a long way towards democratization of NRM debate. Why putting them at the core and NOT the morphological unit (the Forest?) > The reason is, as previously said, that Territory is an Historical product, meaning it is the product of social relations produced by Human beings therefore the attention should be put on them (those who provoke changes) and not on the final product. The pedagogy of putting them first is also related to the neglected role they have played in the policy arena. Both Left as well as Right wing parties have tended to consider them as passed away, old fashioned.. not useful to project the country into future. Our view is exactly the contrary. Only rooting in the past you can thinks about options for the future. No determinism – simply underlying the importance of history. Mozambique has been an example of that, as are the cases of Bissau, Angola, and others. In the second part, when discussing about the case study, we will provide more insights on the details of the program. The point here is to underline the fact that Communities define their territories and that an interesting discussion started here, for the first time,. with FO people, to start confronting different approaches. Whilst in our case Human beings where those defining territories, for FO the management unit was the forest (morphological unit). Implications of our choice People first means a sort of rights (and obligations) based approach. It also means that your (land) rights are to be recognized and respected by your neighbours. Without a social legitimacy, provided by the neighbours, no way for your land rights to be recognized. It means a way of thinking about laws, policies, centred on people, and not environmental management unit (like forest). Those people have rights, and obligations, and their rights are not limited to their “spatial” rights but they extend to Participation in the Policy Making. They become actors, not subjects. This has implications (i) in the way FAO has to work and (ii) in the central question of asymmetries of power. Way of FAO working Toward Facilitator Asymmetries of Power. Clearly the more we stand for recognition of the critical role of local communities as Management units of their territories, the more we are telling central Gvts that they need to revise their way of conceiving how to run power. More decentralization, more participation and more bottom-up means a different equilibrium of forces, which is not necessarily welcomed by present Gvt. Return to slide 7
During the four days of the conference (7-10 March 2006), participants from more than 100 countries reviewed different experiences of agrarian reform around the world, analyzing processes, impacts, mechanisms and participation schemes, and made proposals for future action.

The consensus-based principles emerged from ICARRD highlighted that:

A number of fundamental rights should be better recognized in policies, institutional patterns and plans (e.g. land and natural resources, food security, women, indigenous peoples, pastoralists and vulnerable groups. Land and other natural resources are not only economic assets but also cultural, social and historical assets. Therefore, there is a need to address them in an integrated and territorial way through negotiation, dialogue and participatory approaches.

Secure access to land and natural resources are essential but not sufficient to address poverty reduction. There is also a need for:

productive aspects – emphasis on role of family farming and other small-scale production system

Mozambique has been the arena where for the first time NR and FO have started to develop a common reflection.

In the Mozambique’s experience have been tested and developed the Participatory Land Delimitation methodology. The methodology of the Technical Annex considers the community itself as the major player in the identification of its rights and the delimitation of its corresponding territory. An external team facilitates the process of self-determination by providing the community with a set of tools that can be used to translate indigenous knowledge into a form that can be registered in a modern registry system, the National Cadastre. This method is genuinely participatory because the communities identify their own values while the technical team facilitates the process. It relies heavily on the findings of the participatory rural appraisal, including participatory mapping.
End notes

[Slide 17]: An example of this convergent path is Ethiopia, to be detailed in the second session with a video projection. Another initiative that we are currently developing jointly with FO and LEG is in Nepal.

Return to slide 17

[Slide 18]: What are the lessons learned and prospects for future work:
Conflicts are usually NR based. FAO HAS to be present there
No longer as provider of High Level expertise but as Facilitator of dialogue, searching for nationally owned solutions
Promoting horizontal dialogue between social sciences and technological based is a tough task – this needs not just internal (FAO) encouragement but also Senior Managers who have the Vision on this
Addressing asymmetries of powers means entering into critical issues – FAO should become more active and accepting the role of telling frankly (confidentially) Gvts based on our experience, what are the positive/negative lessons learned in order to facilitate internal policy dialogue
Creating space for weaker actors to actively participate in policy dialogue is easy to say than to do. FAO should become more active on this and pushing for these spaces of dialogue and negotiation to be created, with FAO as Facilitators.

Return to slide 18