

The Role of South-South Cooperation in Agricultural Development in Africa: Opportunities and Challenges

17 May 2012

Brasília

Introduction

Even with economic growth and diversification in recent years, sub-Saharan Africa faces challenges in promoting sustainable human development. The region has been hit hard by food deficits caused by volatile commodity prices. Macropolicy efforts aimed at enhancing agricultural productivity and profitability, as well as international trade, have not been sufficient to ensure food security, inclusiveness and environmental sustainability. A number of African countries still struggle with malnutrition, insufficient arable and irrigated land, energy gaps, water scarcity, climate variability and gender inequality.

In this context, South-South Cooperation offers an opportunity for mutual learning based on sharing successful development experiences that involve the commercial, productive and social dimensions of agriculture. A leitmotif of Brazilian foreign policy has been expanding the country's presence abroad as a development cooperation partner. Given Brazil's internationally recognized advances in agriculture as an economic activity — as well as its accomplishments in social inclusion — it is not surprising that agriculture ranks first in Brazilian technical cooperation in Africa. Other emerging development actors, such as China, are also a growing presence.

On 17 May 2012, specialists and practitioners of South-South Cooperation in agriculture from Africa, Brazil, China and Europe gathered in Brasília to participate in an international seminar titled “The Role of South-South Cooperation in Agricultural Development in Africa: Opportunities and Challenges.” The International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth (IPC-IG) hosted the seminar, which was co-organized by the Future Agricultures Consortium (FAC) with support from the UK Department for International Development (DFID), the South-South Cooperation Research and Policy Center (Articulação SUL), the International Centre for Agricultural Research and Development (CIRAD) and UN Women.

The seminar’s primary goal was to identify key emerging issues for policy and research in the field of South-South Cooperation in agriculture in Africa. By bringing together a broad range of actors with diverse views, the seminar aimed to:

- assess the challenges facing sub-Saharan African countries and the current or potential contribution of Brazilian cooperation to meeting those challenges;
- include perspectives of other key actors that could be involved in South-South Cooperation, in practice and in research, in order to render initiatives more effective and sustainable; and
- stimulate comparative analysis by considering key lessons from the Chinese experience in Africa.

Summary of key points

The seminar attracted representatives from government, academia, research institutions and civil society organizations across Africa, Brazil, China and Europe. More than 100 participants from 15 countries attended the seminar, from both the developing South and the developed North. Several embassies, particularly from Africa, also participated.

Key points from the discussion include:

- **African challenges and opportunities.** African agriculture faces significant challenges across three main areas: food security, productivity and environmental sustainability. Each is important and should be addressed in an integrated fashion. There are also opportunities that should be explored, such as the growing global demand for food.
- **The Brazil success story in agriculture and its relevance to Africa.** In less than three decades, Brazil has evolved from a net food importer to a net food exporter. It has also successfully combined economic growth with social inclusion. Brazil's progress in agricultural development has been fueled by a combination of environmental, technological, institutional, political and financial factors.

Nevertheless, Brazil continues to face internal challenges that should be recognized when applying its “success models” to Africa. For example, limited access to land and credit remain a problem for family farms and women farmers in particular. Environmental sustainability also remains a critical challenge and Brazilian experiences with sustainable agriculture development (“agroecology”) are not yet adequately represented in cooperation packages for Africa.

- **Brazilian agriculture model(s) on offer.** Brazil exports a model of agricultural development that combines elements of family farming and agribusiness — two very different agricultural production systems. Critics view this as a dual model with inherent contradictions. The Government of Brazil views the model as reflecting a natural

division of labour in a complex sector. Argentina's engagement in South-South Agriculture Cooperation appears similar to Brazil's.

- **Broad features and drivers of Brazilian cooperation.** The main characteristics of Brazilian cooperation are horizontality, focus in capacity building and direct delivery through civil servants or specialized private institutions. Technical cooperation is provided mostly in kind. There are also financial forms of cooperation, including debt relief and concessional lending. Brazil is increasingly a provider of humanitarian assistance, including food aid. Solidarity has been a central argument for expanding cooperation with Africa, but a “mutual benefits” view is now growing in public discourse, reflecting President Dilma Rousseff's pragmatic approach to foreign relations.
- **Recent trends in agricultural cooperation.** There are several ongoing shifts in Brazilian agricultural cooperation: a shift from isolated initiatives to structuring projects; a shift towards initiatives that combine technical and financial cooperation; a shift from sporadic engagement to a tighter relationship with the private sector; and a shift from bilateral to trilateral and multi-stakeholder initiatives.
- **Challenges facing Brazilian cooperation.** Brazilian cooperation faces a number of challenges: a fragmented institutional framework governing overall cooperation relations; institutional inadequacy of the agency coordinating technical cooperation (in terms of managerial autonomy and human resources); lack of policy guidelines; limited interaction with domestic civil society organizations (CSOs), social movements and knowledge-based organizations; and inadequate knowledge management and monitoring and evaluation systems (for retaining institutional memory and lesson learnt).

- **Brazil and China compared.** Brazilian and Chinese cooperation differ in principles, decision-making processes, the role of financial cooperation and economic interests, and the degree of engagement in trilateral cooperation. For instance, while Chinese discourse emphasizes economic cooperation, the Brazilian approach focuses on the solidarity, non-commercial aspects of cooperation.

Nevertheless, there are challenges common to Brazilian and Chinese cooperation. These include the lack of transparency and accountability; the promotion of multiple missions without a long-term vision of cooperation; the poor adaptation of projects to local conditions; a gap between project design at the political/diplomatic levels and on-the-ground knowledge; and the need for emerging donors to learn from each other and traditional donors.

Recommendations

The following recommendations for more effective cooperation engagements in agriculture emerged from the discussions:

- **Adapting to local context.** There is a need to qualify requests for assistance demands according to transparent criteria designed to ensure effectiveness and adapt technologies not only to soil and climate conditions, but also to the political, social and economic particularities of each partner.
- **Greater alignment or coherence between South-South Cooperation models and existing agricultural policy processes in Africa.** Greater links or coherence with regional sectoral plans, such as The New Partnership for Africa's Development

(NEPAD) Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme, would help avoid duplication and strengthen the quality of development results and outcomes.

- **Building broad development partnerships.** Expanding partnerships could improve responses to complex development challenges related to agriculture productivity, food security, environmental degradation and climate risk. This means working with a broad range of development actors, including partner country stakeholders (local governments, non-state actors and the private sector) and international players (traditional and emerging donors) to build on development successes and learn from development failures.

- **Engaging civil society on both sides of the Atlantic.** Civil society engagement can improve development effectiveness in several ways. It can boost accountability and transparency, stimulate public monitoring and evaluation, and improve the coherence of Brazilian cooperation through bottom-up approaches. Civil society engagement can also help ensure that African countries understand the negative environmental and social externalities associated with the Brazilian agribusiness model and explore the potential to replicate Brazilian experiences with sustainable and inclusive agriculture — agroecology.

- **Research agenda.** Gaps remain, related not only to Brazilian agricultural cooperation policy and practice, but also to how Brazilian cooperation reflects the country's own agricultural development experiences. A forward-looking research agenda should focus on:
 - analysing the determinants, successes and failures of Brazilian rural development;

- learning how civil society has mobilized itself in Brazil to render public policies more inclusive and gauging the effectiveness of this mobilization;
- learning how Brazilian CSOs and social movements are connecting with counterparts in other developing countries and the challenges they face in doing so;
- learning how relationships among agribusiness, small farmers and the government in Brazil and Africa help strengthen mutual gains and scale up inclusive and sustainable initiatives;
- understanding the role of bureaucracy in agricultural development in both Brazil and Africa;
- comparing African experiences of agricultural cooperation with emerging development actors such as the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa), and with traditional donors, in order to develop an objective account of similarities and differences across development models;
- comparing bilateral and trilateral/multi-stakeholder initiatives engaging emerging donors in Africa;
- identifying mechanisms for the effective delivery of South-South Cooperation; and
- capturing Brazilian understandings of agricultural development in Africa and African understandings of agricultural development in Brazil.

Opening session

Participants and main messages:

Mr. Jorge Chediek, Interim Director, International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth (IPC-IG); Resident Coordinator, UN System in Brazil and Resident Representative, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Main message: Traditional models do not provide immediate answers to the urgency of fighting hunger. There is a need to identify innovative knowledge and translate it into policies and practices that benefit the lives of the most vulnerable people.

Minister Marco Farani, Director of the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC), Ministry of External Relations, Government of Brazil

Main message: Brazil's richness of experiences and cultural diversity need to be translated into a more active engagement in international cooperation. Establishing an autonomous cooperation agency with robust financial resources and engaging domestic civil society, including knowledge-based organizations, is essential.

Dr. Tom Owiyo, Senior Agriculture and Climate Change Specialist, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa African Climate Policy Centre (ACPC/UNECA)

Main message: For sub-Saharan Africa to meet its agricultural potential, a realistic path must be forged. This includes technical solutions, institutional frameworks and financing.

Dr. Dan Bradley, First Secretary, Climate and Development, UK Department for International Development (DFID)

Main message: The challenges of guaranteeing inclusive and sustainable agriculture, as well as food and nutritional security, demand collective engagement and innovative policies.

Ms. Lidia Cabral, Research Associate, Overseas Development Institute (ODI) and Future Agricultures Consortium (FAC)

Main message: Effective agricultural development requires understanding and articulating the diversity of agriculture systems in Africa and of actors engaged in cooperation with the continent.

Summary of discussion

The opening session highlighted how the global challenge of achieving food security and sustainable agricultural development affects Africa and South-South Cooperation.

Mr. Jorge Chediek emphasized that some African countries have taken innovative approaches to development, with examples of initiatives that successfully integrate economic development, social development and environmental protection. Examples include South Africa's Expanded Public Works Programme, Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Programme, Senegal's Agency of

Execution of Works of Public Interest, Botswana's Labour-Intensive Public Works, and Zambia's Micro-Project Unit.

Dr. Tom Owiyo noted that despite possessing 60 per cent of Earth's cultivable land, Africa remains the only region where food production and agriculture productivity is declining. Africa is today a net food importer, a reversal from the 1960s. This turnabout is principally a result of under-investment; African countries invest only about 4 per cent of their annual budgets in agriculture, despite the fact that the sector contributes about 40 per cent of domestic growth product GDP).

Given the mounting demand for food, there is an opportunity for Africa to develop its agriculture, not only as a path to food security and poverty reduction, but also as an economic activity in itself. Such development demands technical, institutional and financial solutions, and cooperation should be aligned to regional initiatives, such as NEPAD's Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme, which defines goals and establishes commitments for boosting sustainable agricultural productivity.

Minister Marco Farani stated that expectations about the internationalization of Brazilian development experiences have been accompanied by institutional, financial and knowledge gaps. These gaps must be overcome if initiatives are to become more effective. Promoting partnerships with Brazilian knowledge-based organizations is an essential step towards bringing civil society's expertise to bear on technical cooperation.

Dr. Dan Bradley explained that DFID recently established a three-year partnership with the Brazilian Government to explore a range of ways to validate and test agricultural innovations,

policy approaches and strategies in African countries. DFID has similar initiatives in China, India and South Africa.

According to Dr. Bradley, high-level partnerships should be informed by innovative thinking that nurtures sustainable agriculture development. At the same time, partnerships must be built on existing capacities and institutions, and respect the diversity of thinking and practices. With that in mind, Ms. Lidia Cabral explained that FAC was established in 2005 as an independent learning alliance dedicated to articulating national, regional and international multidisciplinary perspectives on African agriculture. She noted that FAC is also engaged in analysing Brazil and China's engagements in agriculture cooperation in Africa.

The high-level participants in the opening session noted many common issues and expressed similar concerns. They recognized that developing countries in other regions have accumulated lessons that can be shared with African countries, and expressed consensus about the relevance of the Brazilian experience to Africa's development challenges, including the potential for rapid positive changes. The participants found that Brazil's rise from a net food importer to a net food exporter could hold valuable lessons for African countries. Even more relevant, they found, was Brazil's success in effectively combining economic growth with social inclusion, which has become a model for development challenges across the South, including hunger and exclusion.

Additionally, the speakers highlighted a number of broad development challenges related to agriculture — food security, environmental degradation, climate risk — that demand broader engagement, even beyond some of the models at the heart of cooperation in the agricultural sector. The partnership between the Brazilian government and UNDP that resulted in the creation of IPC-IG in 2004 has been critical to expanding knowledge and enabling the application of Brazil's success stories. It was widely agreed that the seminar could provide space

to further focus that work and expand dialogue among developing countries. This dialogue could build on the work of IPC-IG's Rural and Sustainable Development team, which is already moving to collect, systematize and analyse lessons learnt across the South in this domain.

The opening session's main messages, which converged with the seminar's rationale, emphasized the need to collect and systematize evidence-based knowledge on South-South Cooperation so that it can be better understood and translated into policies and practices that benefit the most vulnerable sectors in Africa.

Panel 1

Brazilian cooperation for development: A new paradigm for agricultural development in Africa?

Participants and main messages:

Chair: Arilson Favareto, Permanent Researcher at Centro Brasileiro de Análise e Planejamento (Cebrap) and professor at Universidade Federal do ABC (UFABC)

Main message: Brazilian agriculture is heterogeneous. There is no single model, but a collection of initiatives with varied degrees of innovation. Relying on local trajectories can be a path to successful policies, in domestic as well as in international cooperation initiatives.

Speaker 1: Ministro Milton Rondó, Head of Coordenação-Geral de Ações Internacionais de Combate à Fome, Ministério das Relações Exteriores (MRE)

Main message: Brazil should build a coherent engagement process and framework for horizontal cooperation. The participation of social movements will be essential towards that end. Successful redistributive policies result from better participation.

Speaker 2: André Dusi, Structuring Projects Coordinator, Secretaria de Relações Internacionais, Embrapa

Main message: Embrapa does not transfer packages to partner countries but seeks to match demand with available and appropriate technologies from the Brazilian experience.

Technologies that are selected for cooperation activities are further validated based on local characteristics, including political, social and economic dimensions.

Speaker 3: Francesco Pierri, Head of Assessoria para Assuntos Internacionais e de Promoção Comercial, Ministério de Desenvolvimento Agrário (MDA)

Main message: Brazil's domestic disputes in the agricultural domain are reflected in its cooperation with Africa. These disputes result from Brazil's democratic nature, which means that its policies sometimes sit at the intersection of conflicting— and at times complementary — interests. This dual model allows Brazil to respond to both elements of the demand from African countries: agribusiness and family farming. Still, an important lesson learnt is the key role of the state in agrarian development.

Speaker 4: Elisa Hugueney, ActionAid Brazil

Main message: Although Brazilian cooperation has exponentially grown over the last years, it still faces the challenges of insufficient resources, lack of a regulatory framework and inadequate accountability and transparency. Some of the practices that have been exported remain highly contested by social movements in Brazil.

Discussant: Langton Mukwereza, Research for Development Trust, Zimbabwe

Main message: Although Brazilian cooperation with African countries is relatively open to African demands, the Brazilian model cannot be automatically replicated in Africa. The

continent's particular conditions, such as poor civil society mobilization and poor infrastructure, should be acknowledged in order to effectively adapt initiatives, which would help build processes that lead to inclusive participation and benefit-sharing, as well as a stronger sector.

Overview

The aim of the first panel was to discuss the attributes of the Brazilian cooperation model, reflect on its novelty, and illuminate the challenges and opportunities it faces domestically, internationally and at the local level in the countries where it is implemented.

Five questions guided the discussion:

1. What do you see as the main characteristics of Brazilian development cooperation, with particular reference to agriculture? Do such attributes differentiate the Brazilian model from other countries' approaches?
2. What are the explicit and implicit motivations driving and shaping Brazilian cooperation? Are these different in agriculture?
3. What lessons from Brazil's agribusiness and smallholder development experiences have helped shape Brazilian cooperation with African agriculture?
4. What will the key challenges be in validating and adapting Brazilian approaches to agricultural development in African contexts?

5. As the current Brazilian administration consolidates its position on domestic politics and international governance, what new trends are expected to emerge in development cooperation, particularly in agriculture?

Summary of discussion

Participants agreed on the distinctive characteristics of Brazilian cooperation. The model was described as more horizontal (thus open to partners' demands) and less conditional than some other development models. It was also described as possessing the potential to enable greater social inclusion and capacity building. One of the speakers, however, pointed out that commercial interests remain an influential factor in the allocation of resources.

Another distinctive characteristic highlighted by one of the panelists is that Brazilian cooperation is largely delivered by public institutions. This was viewed as beneficial because it can lead to strong institutional values, long-term compromise and enhanced sustainability through institutional linkages.

The panelist from the Brazilian Agriculture Research Corporation (Embrapa) noted that Embrapa's initiatives are designed with local characteristics in mind. Initiatives are adapted not only to local soil and climate conditions, but also to local political, social and economic conditions. Requests for assistance are substantively evaluated, often in light of broader dimensions of cooperation and policy.

Finally, Brazilian cooperation can be differentiated from other models by the fact that there is no direct transfer of financial resources, although there was no consensus on the desirability of such an approach. While technical cooperation is often praised for its greater potential for

sustainability and ownership, some participants noted that China and India allocate more financial resources to Africa than Brazil.

Participants also noted that there have been important shifts in Brazilian development cooperation, including the launch of initiatives that combine technical and financial cooperation, as well as public and private partners. In agriculture, this model has been introduced by the More Food Africa program, which applies an intersectoral approach (combining agricultural and industrial efforts) to sustainably increase family farming productivity and reinforce national food security strategies and goals. At the same time, it was noted that a multi-tier and multisectoral approach often slows deliberations and implementation.

Another recognized trend is the effort to optimize capacity building and related training initiatives by offering courses on a regular basis. In agricultural cooperation, a significant shift in this direction occurred in 2010 with the inauguration of Embrapa's Unit of Strategic Studies and Training. The unit has designed a portfolio of 20 training courses in tropical agriculture in partnership with the Brazilian Cooperation Agency.

A third notable trend is the shift from isolated initiatives induced by presidential diplomacy to a focus in structuring projects. This has resulted from Embrapa's efforts in internal professionalization and reflection on lessons learnt. Several demands from one country, which were identified by Embrapa as isolated initiatives, began to be consolidated in a broader framework aimed at combining institutional, training and technological adaptation fronts in regional hub countries.

Embrapa offered four examples of this approach: a rice project in Senegal; a cotton project in Mali; a soy project in Mozambique; and a broader initiative, still under design, to promote

climate-smart agriculture in nine African countries. The project in Mozambique involves triangular cooperation with the Japanese Cooperation Agency. It integrates initiatives to restructure the country's National Institute for Agriculture Research and creates a family agriculture chain in vegetable production through triangular cooperation with the US Agency for International Development. The climate-smart agriculture initiative is an example of triangular cooperation with DFID.

Finally, participants agreed that there has been a clear shift from bilateral to trilateral and multi-stakeholders initiatives. Besides the structuring projects that engage traditional donors listed above, two other examples were mentioned. The Africa-Brazil Innovation Marketplace was launched in 2010 and aims to develop cooperative projects by linking Brazilian and African experts and institutions with financial and technical support from several agencies (a similar initiative focusing on Latin America and the Caribbean was launched in 2011). A partnership between the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the World Food Programme seeks to establish local food purchase initiatives in Ethiopia, Malawi, Mozambique, Niger and Senegal. Brazil will fund the project and share expertise drawn from its own national Food Purchase Programme.

Seminar participants next noted a lack of consensus on the desirability of channeling Brazilian resources through multilateral organizations, which are the primary channel for Brazilian development cooperation (76.5 per cent of Brazilian aid flowed through multilateral organizations between 2005 and 2009). One presenter noted that although working with international organizations entails challenges, such as expenses reporting, Brazilian resources channeled through the World Food Programme, for example, are earmarked for specific use. Expanding partnerships can be a powerful tool to improve the international coordination of initiatives to fight hunger.

The ensuing discussion highlighted some of the ongoing challenges for Brazilian development cooperation efforts. These include the fragmentation of agriculture cooperation along two fronts. On the one hand are strategies and policies aimed at eradicating hunger and poverty; on the other are technical exchanges financed by agribusiness sectors. Still, there was no consensus on Brazilian agriculture model(s).

One of the panelists expressed concern about the tendency of agriculture projects in Africa to prioritize modernization processes with high social costs. He acknowledged, however, that the Brazilian model itself is still under construction. He repudiated the notion of dualism by stressing that both agribusiness and family agriculture face challenges related to low productivity and social and environmental issues. Finally, he noted that although Brazil may be exporting various models in agriculture, they are likely to evolve given the ongoing debate in Brazil about the models and the African demand for both types.

One of the participants introduced a new dimension to the discussion by asserting that in broader rural development terms — especially health, education and urban policies — some Brazilian experiences prove that dynamic agro-industrial poles can facilitate the greater generation and distribution of resources.

Another panelist noted that successful Brazilian food security initiatives have been grounded in local demands and trajectories and backed by the goal of food sovereignty. According to the panelist, this framework raises expectations that cooperation with African countries will replicate a similar context and approach.

A clear consensus emerged among the panelists on the challenge of improving the relatively poor involvement of Brazilian and African CSOs in South-South Cooperation. The panelists identified such involvement as essential for improving the accountability and transparency of initiatives, and for stimulating public monitoring and evaluation, which is hindered by the scarcity of published data on Brazilian cooperation. The involvement of CSOs in South-South Cooperation is also required to improve coherence in Brazilian cooperation by stimulating bottom-up approaches that can anchor exported policies in strong social mobilization and guarantee that the negative environmental and social impacts of the Brazilian rural experience are not exported.

Panelists identified two important areas for future CSO-oriented South-South Cooperation. The first is to examine how Brazilian CSOs and social movements have organized themselves to influence public policies. The role of the National Food and Nutritional Security Council is one example of CSO engagement in influencing public policy. A second area worthy of study is how Brazilian CSOs have engaged in other international cooperative initiatives, such as the Mercosur's Family Agriculture Network or the Haitian humanitarian cooperation civil society forum. Understanding these engagements can help stimulate similar processes in Africa. Participants also recognized that although Brazilian family agriculture movements have established contacts with counterparts in Africa, these contacts are relatively few and ad hoc, and are not generally mainstreamed into the design and delivery of official cooperation.

The discussant noted that replicating in Africa what he saw as a "committed and passionate" engagement among the state and civil society in Brazil would be difficult. He stated that many African governments are not open to criticism, confirming the need to learn from social mobilization experiences in Brazil. Furthermore, although he praised Brazilian cooperation for its horizontality and unconditionality, the discussant criticized the More Food Africa programme

for favouring food production to the detriment of potentially income-generating crops that could be used to buy food. He added that private initiatives cannot solve the problem of poor infrastructure in Africa, and that the role of state is fundamental.

Finally, the panel acknowledged three challenges, albeit briefly due to the tight agenda: the lack of institutional memory related to missions and lessons learnt; the limited information on lessons learnt from traditional forms of cooperation by other donors; and the need to define specific mechanisms for the adaptation of successful models to local realities and development trajectories.

Conclusion

In short, Panel 1 concluded that despite the advantages of the Brazilian cooperation model (horizontality, less conditionality, focus on capacity building), it nevertheless faces ongoing challenges. These include low levels of civil society engagement, a gap between pro-social inclusion rhetoric and practices that may benefit local elites, and insufficient planning and evaluation. However, lessons learnt in recent years are opening space for the design of more effective and efficient initiatives through stronger adaptation, combinations of modalities of cooperation (technical and financial) and engagement in multi-stakeholder schemes.

Panel 2

Agriculture, climate change and green growth in Africa: What role for South-South Cooperation?

Participants and main messages:

Chair: Leisa Perch, IPC-IG

Main message: Inclusive sustainable development demands hard and soft social technologies. South-South Cooperation can be an important instrument in linking the economic, environmental and social dimensions of development.

Speaker 1: Jean-Marc Von der Weid, Assessoria e Serviços a Projetos em Agricultura Alternativa (AS-PTA) and Articulação Nacional de Agroecologia (ANA)

Main message: Adaptability and flexibility are fundamental to the success of agriculture projects aimed at sustainability and inclusiveness. Both elements are key to agroecology and offer opportunities for empowerment and resilience in Brazilian as well as African small farmers.

Speaker 2: Lindiwe Sibanda, Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN), South Africa

Main message: The main lesson from Brazilian agriculture for African countries is that a combination of people, policies and institutions is required to advance agriculture development.

Speaker 3: Justina Ines Cima, Movimento de Mulheres Camponesas

Main message: Brazil should not transfer its failures in agriculture. The most important agents in agriculture — small farming and women farmers — do not receive adequate incentives from the Government of Brazil.

Speaker 4: Darana Souza, Centre of Excellence Against Hunger, World Food Programme

Main message: Brazil should consider the trajectory of its domestic multi-tier, multidimensional and multi-stakeholder initiatives in order to engage in resilient programmes aimed at fighting food insecurity in Africa.

Discussant: Kojo Amanor, University of Ghana at Legon

Main message: When cooperating with African countries, Brazil should bear in mind that the conditions required for inclusive agriculture, such as strong civil society mobilization and a strong state, are not necessarily present in African countries.

Overview

The second panel examined the role that Brazilian cooperation can play in helping African countries overcome policy and capacity gaps in climate change adaptation planning and social protection. The panel was composed of representatives of non-governmental organizations who brought a diversity of views on inclusion and sustainability to South-South Cooperation, and

who were positioned to question the legitimacy and effectiveness of current official cooperation in agriculture between Brazil and Africa.

The panel's discussions were guided by four questions:

1. Are the agricultural models being discussed through South-South exchanges environmentally friendly/climate-resilient, pro-poor and economically viable in the long term?
2. What is the evidence that good practices from Brazil will work in Africa? What might be the key factors for success?
3. How relevant are lessons from the process of engagement that involve government, civil society and the private sector for securing a more sustainable approach to agriculture?
4. What lessons emerge from Brazil and Africa's experiences in agribusiness?

Summary of discussion

The first speaker considered several sustainability questions related to how environmental, technological, political and institutional dynamics have been effectively combined in Brazil to boost tropical food production. The speaker highlighted consistent and long-term investment in research that results in new technologies — such as seeds adapted to acidic soils and the introduction of rhizobium bacteria to reduce the use of fertilizers — as a driver of increased food production. A second driver is the introduction of new methods (such as direct planting) that reduce production costs and environmental impacts. Preferential credit, trade liberalization,

market deregulation, public purchases and public-private partnerships have also helped boost production. Each of these elements is individually and strategically relevant to Africa's agriculture, now and in the future.

Based on the NEPAD Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme framework, the Brazilian model could support several areas of intervention:

- assessing and mapping soil fertility;
- greening the soil;
- investing in irrigation infrastructure;
- promoting farm water harvesting and storage technologies;
- adapting and adopting suitable technologies;
- matching crops to the climate, culture and farm environment;
- presenting technology packages rather than technology bullets;
- fitting technology to the users;
- providing social protection for vulnerable groups;
- providing training aimed at modernizing agriculture;
- providing affordable finance packages;
- promoting targeted subsidies;
- engaging CSOs and social movements;
- promoting public-private partnerships; and
- modernizing subsistence, commercial and large-scale agriculture through a systematic approach.

The juxtaposition of lessons and innovations next to Africa's needs helped illuminate both the broader development context of agriculture as well as opportunities and challenges. A summary

point that emerged from the analysis was the pivotal role that people, policies and institutions can play in defining and implementing an inclusive and sustainable model of agriculture, particularly in the South.

Contributions by other panels highlighted the ongoing debate on the success of the Brazilian models as well as areas for growth. Panelists from AS-PTA and Movimento de Mulheres Camponesas criticized the agribusiness model, noting a number of domestic social and environmental impacts and questioning whether this approach should be transferred, as is, to other countries. This critique covered some of the negative impacts of the agribusiness model, including the impact on human health of agrototoxic overuse; the limited autonomy of small-scale farmers and the promotion of genetic erosion of seeds by the spread of transgenics; social conflicts about expanding agribusiness to spaces that were previously occupied by indigenous people and *quilombos*; and destroying native forests. With these impacts in mind, the production costs associated with agribusiness were deemed high enough to perhaps counterbalance the benefits.

Moreover, panelists rejected the possibility of a harmonious coexistence between family agriculture and agribusiness. The data presented exposed a deep imbalance between the economic and social importance of family farming — which generates 70 per cent of the food consumed domestically and 74 per cent of rural employment in Brazil — and the incentive structure in which it functions. Family farming benefits from only 14 per cent of credits offered to agriculture in Brazil and uses only 24 per cent of national cultivable land. Furthermore, the discrepancy between the importance of women's work in food production and its undervaluation — expressed in limited access to credit and decision-making processes and vulnerability to rural violence — hampers the effectiveness of agriculture as a path from poverty to economic and social equality.

At the same time, several alternatives were highlighted that could lend currency to sustainable and inclusive agriculture and be scaled up to improve the coherence of Brazilian engagement in South-South Cooperation. For example, agroecology was deemed appropriate for promoting more inclusive and environmentally friendly agriculture. If applied on a broad scale to family farming (since organic food is more expensive), it can also be economically viable, reaching productivity levels similar or even superior to agribusiness. Brazil has made progress towards this end with the creation of a national articulation mechanism that seeks to guarantee, among other things, a more diffuse water supply. The enhanced engagement of national researchers in agroecology is also helping: a forum of more than 400 researchers from Embrapa has produced a framework on agroecology, providing an opportunity for the institutionalization of this approach.

The panel suggested that agroecology is more appropriate for South-South transfer than agribusiness given its whole-systems approach, which combines traditional knowledge and local experiences in food production with hard technologies, economic viability and sustainable practices. Advancing the concept in Africa would require engaging a broad range of actors and promoting the voices of CSOs and small-scale farmer groups compared with more traditional interests and perspectives.

The panel also noted the role of international networks and organizations in scaling up innovative experiences. Two examples were mentioned. First, in Kenya, the work of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research — a global partnership that promotes inclusive, healthy and sustainable food production — was noted as a model of integration between laboratory research and concrete local development processes.

The second example of a successful application of an international network comes from the Centre for Excellence Against Hunger, a partnership of the Government of Brazil and the World Food Programme. Drawing on Brazilian experiences, such as the Home Grown School Feeding programme and Purchase for Progress, the Centre aims to support governments in developing countries in the areas of school feeding, nutrition and food security. Relying on in-depth research on the drivers of the Brazilian food security policy experience (its multidimensional, multisectoral, multi-stakeholder and multi-tier dimensions), the Centre will be one of the leading institutions in the implementation of the Food Purchase Programme in Africa. This programme, which will start in 2012 and target 10 African countries through two strategies (humanitarian and technical cooperation), seeks to contribute to food security and income generation by linking small-scale farmers to food assistance initiatives through local food purchase.

The discussant challenged the panel by raising a number of critical questions. He noted that the structural nature of the Brazilian approach forced a compromise between agribusiness and family farming that, however uneasy, seems to inhibit each side's achievements from disadvantaging the other. He wondered how a similar contract could be designed in African countries, particularly countries that have experienced an increase in large-scale agriculture and a consequent displacement of small farmers, including a large number of women. In these countries, governance has been decentralized away from the government and towards the private sector. If the Government of Brazil supports governments where such pro-market social inclusion policies are occurring, then it fails to challenge mainstream development approaches. Ultimately, then, the country would not be able to position itself as a differentiated actor in international development cooperation.

Conclusion

Although the African participants in Panel 2 voiced admiration for Brazilian agriculture practices and models, the Brazilian participants questioned the ability of those models to promote real social inclusion and respect for the environment, human health and the right of minorities. This does not imply that none of the practices to emerge from Brazil are beneficial. Examples range from the Food Purchase Programme to agroecology. However, it is necessary to bring these successful approaches to scale. Fortunately, there are already mechanisms in place to assist with that task.

PANEL 3

Brazil and China in Africa: Similarities and differences in South-South exchanges

Participants and main messages:

Chair: Alex Shankland, Institute of Development Studies (IDS)/FAC, UK

Main message: To design more effective cooperation initiatives, emerging powers should learn from each other's experiences, as well as from the experiences of traditional donors.

Speaker 1: Paulo Esteves, BRICS Policy Centre, Brazil

Main message: The heterogeneity of the BRICS in terms of particular state, market and society relations is reflected in the way each provides international development cooperation. With that in mind, and considering that emerging donors might be reproducing traditional practices (tied aid, lack of transparency etc.), we should question the very concept of South-South Cooperation.

Speaker 2: Qi Gubo, China Agricultural University, China

Main message: China is shifting the way it provides cooperation to Africa, but there are still challenges it must resolve, such as balancing the public and private benefits of its cooperation.

Speaker 3: Frédéric Goulet, International Centre for Agricultural Research and Development (CIRAD), France

Main message: Although Brazil and China's cooperation with African countries have been contrasted, and the greater role of private initiatives in Chinese cooperation has been noted, initiatives such as Pro-Savannah and More Food Africa point to a tighter relationship between public cooperation and private investment in Brazilian cooperation.

Discussant: Sérgio Chichava, Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Económicos (IESE) /FAC,
Mozambique

Main message: There is a need for field work comparing the BRICS presence in Africa in order to assess the pertinence of the concept of South-South Cooperation.

Overview

The third panel presented a comparative perspective on Brazilian and Chinese engagements with Africa, highlighting differences and commonalities in how each conceptualizes and practices agricultural development cooperation.

Five questions guided the panel's discussions:

1. What do you see as the main attributes of Chinese development cooperation with Africa?
How well does cooperation reflect the lessons from China's own agricultural development?
2. What are the similarities and differences between Brazil and China in the way they think about and practice development cooperation?

3. What are the similarities and differences between Brazil and China's respective motivations and priorities for development cooperation with Africa?
4. What complementarities can be identified between Brazilian and Chinese approaches to agricultural development cooperation?
5. How might Brazil and China work together in this field in future?

Summary of discussion

Discussions ranged from broad framework dilemmas to specific issues concerning relationships between emerging donors, particularly Brazil and China, and African countries. Reflections on the broader international political context, for example, highlighted that the emergence of the BRICS brings plurality to the international order, which until now has largely reflected Western values and norms (democracy, market, conditional technical assistance).

The cohesion and collective power of the BRICS, however, was questioned because of each country's particular domestic characteristics concerning relations among the state, market and society. Such particularities were deemed likely to create significant difficulties in the design and implementation of a common international agenda or approach to international affairs, and at the same time would imply a number of nuanced differences in the type, scale and scope of cooperation offered by each of them.

Furthermore, data presented by one panelist underscored the fact that cooperation by the BRICS still lags behind the expectations created by official discourses. The group's share of global

development cooperation, based on 2007 data, was 3.1 per cent, compared with 69.2 per cent for Development Assistance Committee/Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (DAC/OECD) countries, and against 27.7 percent of non-DAC countries. Notably, none of the BRICS appeared in the list of the top 10 donors to Africa; this group alone was responsible for 63 per cent of net disbursements in 2008.

A point of departure for the debate over Brazil and China's engagement in South-South Cooperation emerged around the nature of the discourses, institutions and practices: were the principles of common benefits, non-intervention and horizontality really being put into practice? How different are their engagements compared with traditional donors? How conventional are Brazilian and Chinese modes of development cooperation in Africa?

The presentations highlighted several commonalities and differences between Brazilian and Chinese cooperation. It was noted that both countries prioritize horizontality, although the Brazilian discourse is characterized by a focus on solidarity, while the Chinese discourse emphasizes economic cooperation. Additionally, the countries hold similar diplomatic and technological instruments for engagement in Africa (the Forum on China-Africa Cooperation; the Brazil-Africa Dialogue on Food Security, Fight Against Hunger, and Rural Development; the China-Africa Think-Tanks Forum; and the Africa-Brazil Innovation Marketplace).

In terms of domestic systems, China's aid was characterized as dominated by a vertical decision-making process guided by economic and political interests, particularly access to raw materials. The role of economic interests is reflected in the prominence of the Ministry of Commerce and the Export-Import Bank of China in defining Chinese aid allocation. The emphasis on projects that facilitate the increased production of goods in sectors that are complementary to the Chinese

economy is also revealing. However, one speaker noted that China is moving from a project-based approach to a more strategic and sustainable form of institutional development.

In the case of Brazil, panelists noted that the Brazilian Cooperation Agency, which is linked to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and reflects Brazilian foreign policy priorities, is the main player. It operates in a context defined by the lack of a legal framework governing the provision of international development cooperation. Compared with Chinese cooperation, the Brazilian domestic framework is more decentralized, and the Brazilian Cooperation Agency has limited capacity to coordinate the engagement of ministries and official agencies. Moreover, there is no clear link between cooperation and economic interests in Brazil.

The Brazilian and Chinese approaches also were presented as contrasting sharply on the issue of the transfer of financial resources. While concessional loans (with varying levels of tied aid) are the main instrument of China's engagement, Brazilian cooperation provided in the form of financial credits is minor, and technical cooperation is considered the main modality. Brazilian financial cooperation, it was noted, is largely undertaken by Brazilian companies with the support of the National Development Bank.

Another difference that emerged from the analysis is the engagement of each country in triangular cooperation. While Brazil was deemed active in projects designed and implemented in partnership with traditional donors (governments and international organizations) and, more recently, with private organizations (such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation), China participated in few initiatives of that kind. However, one speaker stated that since 2000, China has been moving from pure bilateral aid and economic cooperation to an active application of the United Nations's Framework on South-South Cooperation and other multilateral mechanisms in its agricultural assistance to Africa.

Particularities in the way that each country delivers agricultural cooperation were also identified, although it was stressed that their discourse on the central role of technology in development promotion is similar. For example, while China has been establishing local agricultural technology demonstration centres, each with a team of five or six Chinese researchers, Brazil operates through individual researchers from Embrapa who work in local research institutes, thus better integrating with local researchers.

Panelists also contrasted the role of the private sector in Brazil and China's engagement in agriculture cooperation in Africa. In the Chinese case, the role of the private sector became central in the 1990s and is evidenced in three common scenarios: the availability of public incentives for formerly public companies with experience in Africa to invest in the continent; the presence of large companies implementing big projects; and the presence of small entrepreneurs whose production is destined for local markets.

In the case of Brazil, a recent a shift was noted from sporadic engagement (investments in the biofuel industry through joint ventures in Angola, Nigeria, Sudan and Uganda, for example) to a tighter relationship between official cooperation and private investments. Recent examples include the More Food Africa programme, which offers incentives for African countries to import family farming machinery produced by Brazilian industry, and Pro-Savannah, which offers incentives, through public procurement, for national farmers and funds to invest in soybean production in Mozambique.

Panelists identified some of the challenges of Brazilian and Chinese cooperation. For Brazil, challenges include:

- a large gap between Brazilian ambitions and the available capacity to implement them;
- a reliance on categories that cannot be automatically applied to African countries, such as family farming; and
- the need to consider lessons learnt in boosting soy production in Brazil, particularly related to dispersion of local populations and environmental impacts, when exporting national practices.

For China, challenges include:

- balancing public and private benefits in a context marked by the increasing protagonism of private sector ventures;
- integrating Chinese workers and researchers into local communities;
- making Chinese firms responsible for technology extension and knowledge distribution; and
- designing projects for smallholder agriculture development in Africa in light of lessons learnt in China.

Challenges common to Brazil and China include:

- lack of transparency and accountability;
- the promotion of multiple missions without a long-term vision of cooperation;
- poor adaptation of projects to local conditions;
- a gap between project design on political/diplomatic levels and on-the-ground knowledge; and
- a need for emerging donors to learn from each other's experiences and from the experiences of traditional donors.

The discussant added to the lists of challenge for Brazilian and Chinese agricultural cooperation with Africa. He stated that Brazilian institutions fail to recognize that each African country is unique and that initiatives should not be designed and implemented without acknowledging these differences. In the case of China, he criticized its recent strategy of avoiding media attention to its initiatives in Mozambique in order to silence national debates on its presence in the country.

The discussant also identified the need for more systematized knowledge on emerging donors' engagement in Africa as a specific area of policy analysis, research and dialogue. Although there have been several studies on BRICS cooperation in Africa, few rely on field work. This oversight hinders the emergence of reliable conclusions about the differences and commonalities among BRICS countries and between BRICS and traditional donors.

Conclusion

The key point to emerge from Panel 3 is that despite their differences, Brazil and China are shifting their approaches to cooperation in ways that may render their actions in Africa more and more similar. As China shows greater willingness to engage in the sustainable institutional development of its partners and in multilateral mechanisms, it approaches practices that are usually attributed to Brazilian cooperation. Likewise, as Brazil increases its financial cooperation and stimulates its private sector engagement in Africa, it moves closer to practices that are usually associated with the Chinese approach.

Two questions remain unanswered. First, are Brazil and China willing to act together in Africa by coordinating initiatives and avoiding duplication? Second, can the cooperation that both

countries provide differ from traditional cooperation by bringing more symmetrical gains to all partners and truly benefiting African societies?

CLOSING SESSION

Participants and main messages:

Chair: Lídia Cabral, Research Associate, Overseas Development Institute (ODI) and Future Agricultures Consortium (FAC)

Main message: Although there is strong consensus on the need to involve civil society in making South-South Cooperation more effective, it is not easy to replicate state-society relations in countries with different historical-political backgrounds.

Speaker 1: Blessings Chinsinga, Associate Professor, Chancellor College, Malawi and FAC Member

Main message: Although there is an important relationship of trust between Brazil and Africa (attributable in part to Brazil's status as a recipient of cooperation), Brazil needs to better understand particular African countries' politics, society and culture in order to adapt initiatives.

Speaker 2: Iara Costa Leite, Researcher, South-South Cooperation and Policy Center (Articulação SUL)

Main message: When acting in international development initiatives, organizations tend to frame problems in a way that enables them to act and justifies their continued existence. African

organizations and communities should be listened to and priority should be placed on building bridges and identifying the partners who can respond to their demands.

Overview

The closing session summarized the seminar's key discussions and assessed opportunities and challenges for more effective South-South Cooperation with African countries. Panelists also discussed critical issues for future research agendas.

The closing session was framed by four key questions:

1. Is Brazilian cooperation in agriculture currently meeting identified challenges and responding to demand?
2. What would an effective Brazil-Africa cooperation process in agriculture look like?
3. How can Africa play a greater role in setting the agenda for and defining the instruments of South-South Cooperation?
4. What issues should research on South-South Cooperation and agricultural development in Africa focus on?

Summary of discussion

In addition to recapping the seminar's main points, the closing session explored further avenues for research and focused on the challenges for Brazil-Africa South-South Cooperation in agriculture.

First, participants suggested that in order to assess whether Brazilian cooperation with African countries entails a complementary or conflicted model between agribusiness and family farming, it is necessary to fully understand how Brazilian rural development occurred.

This leads to the challenge of applying a model that relies on the centrality of bureaucracy, institutions and leadership to countries where those actors and dynamics are either missing or unique. The panel considered this issue to be critical not only to cooperation with African countries, but also with fragile countries in general. Brazilian cooperation with these countries may be frustrated by the projection of a model that relies on a strong state.

Second, the strong consensus of participants on the role of civil society in boosting the effectiveness of Brazil-Africa cooperation was accompanied by a recognition of the challenges of reproducing the Brazilian model of civil society engagement. That model resulted from spontaneous dynamics between the state and civil society in Brazil; African countries have significantly different social, cultural, political and historical realities. This has particular implications for agroecology, which, while potentially competitive, lucrative and innovative, assumes a degree of civil society mobilization that cannot be taken for granted in the African context.

A third point, also raised by previous panels, concerned the gap between the strong rhetoric about the distinctive characteristics of South-South Cooperation (centred on horizontality) and practices that might end up reproducing traditional approaches, such as tied aid and

conditionalities. Assessing the role that African partners are undertaking in the design of projects, as well as whether they are delivering mutual benefits, was considered critical.

The issue of mutual gains was further qualified in the closing session. Understanding mutual benefits requires opening the state's "black box" and determining which sectors are benefiting most from cooperation initiatives. It was stressed, however, that exploring this issue might lead to a dilemma: respecting recipients' sovereignty could result in projects that do not benefit the most vulnerable, while imposing conditionalities could compromise the distinctive character of South-South Cooperation.

Following an overview of the day's discussions, participants in the closing session presented recommendations for Brazilian cooperation with African countries, as well as a number of avenues for future research and opportunities to deliver better development outcomes. They include:

- **Adaptation.** To make their initiatives more effective, Brazilian organizations engaged in cooperation in Africa should adapt Brazilian experiences to local contexts instead of simply transferring them. This demands both a deep knowledge of the Brazilian processes and dynamics that led to successful experiences and public policies, and an understanding of the particularities of each African country in terms of society, culture, economy and politics.
- **Focus.** The need for adaptation might demand a focus on some countries. This may mean that in order to render its cooperation more effective, Brazil will need to cease providing cooperation to several countries. In order to do that, country programming should be designed on a multi-year basis and should be published, so citizens and organizations from both sides can be informed of reasons, purposes and strategies.

- **Learning.** Brazil could benefit from lessons learnt from traditional donors, as well as from other emerging donors and its own experience in field. Documenting and exchanging such lessons was deemed critical. Learning from African perceptions of Brazilian cooperation was also considered fundamental to improving the impact of initiatives.
- **Promoting exchanges.** The promotion of real exchange with African partners is not only a tool to strengthen horizontality, but also a tool to guarantee broad domestic support for South-South Cooperation in Brazil, even in the face of economic and political turns. It was noted that the seminar brought limited understanding or discussion of the potential for Brazil to learn from African countries. While often expressed in the form of personal experiences, it was deemed worthy of more consideration at an institutional level. How personal learning experiences of Brazilian technicians in field were really being institutionalized in Brazil was often not clear.
- **Expanding domestic partnerships with CSOs.** Brazilian CSOs play an increasingly fundamental role in pressuring for transparency and accountability in official cooperation initiatives. But there is room for that role to expand, particularly in the case of knowledge-based organizations, which could engage more with the Government and other actors by providing evidence-based knowledge and participating in monitoring and evaluation.

Brazil's long-standing experience as a recipient of aid was noted as an asset that makes it more empathetic to African circumstances and perhaps more willing to make the adjustments needed to ensure that its cooperation will positively affect African development. The good news is that the Brazilian Government is not working alone; it can count on the efforts of several institutions at home and abroad undertaking research on Brazilian provision of South-South Cooperation.

NOTE

The South-South Cooperation seminar was followed by a second-day meeting of a smaller number of participants, organized by Embrapa and DFID. The purpose of the meeting was to draw out the practical implications for evidence-based policy and policy-relevant research of the key issues in South-South Cooperation and African agriculture identified at the seminar.

The meeting's agenda included two sessions. The first aimed at facilitating dialogue on policy implications for Brazil-Africa cooperation for agriculture development. The second focused on knowledge gaps and moving the research agenda forward.

Both sessions' key messages were gathered in an Action Plan designed to promote connections in evidence-based research on Brazil-Africa cooperation in agriculture, in order to inform and build effective policies and practices.

The Role of South-South Cooperation in Agricultural Development in Africa: Opportunities and Challenges

Brasília, Thursday 17 May 2012 (09:30 – 17:30)

Venue: PAHO/WHO– Auditório Carlyle Guerra de Macêdo

AGENDA

Time	Sessions	Themes / Objectives	Chairs	Speakers	Discussants
09:30	Opening	General welcome / agenda-setting. Flagging the scale of the global challenge and the effort to meet it – demand for innovative responses.	Jorge Chediek, UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minister Marco Farani, ABC • Lindiwe Sibanda, FANRPAN, South Africa • Dan Bradley, DFID • Lídia Cabral, ODI / FAC 	
10:30-10:45	Coffee break				
10:45	Panel 1 Brazilian cooperation for development: New paradigm for agricultural development in Africa?	Setting Brazilian agricultural development cooperation in its geopolitical and policy context. What are the attributes of the Brazilian model and what challenges is it facing? Reflecting on lessons from different agricultural development models in Brazil and their implications for cooperation with Africa – how to get the blend right?	Arilson Favareto, Cebrap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minister Milton Rondo, CG Fome, MRE • André Dusi, Embrapa • Francesco Pierri, MDA • Alberto Broch, CONTAG (TBC) • Elisa Huguency, ActionAid Brazil 	Langton Mukwereza, Research for Development Trust / FAC – Zimbabwe and Dawit Alemu Bimirew, Ethiopian Agricultural Research Institute / FAC – Ethiopia
12:30-14:00	Lunch				
14:00	Panel 2 Agriculture, climate change and a green economy in Africa: What	Focusing on the opportunities and challenges for African agriculture (in the context of the Rio+20 and post-Durban	Leisa Perch, IPC-IG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jean Marc Van der Weid, Articulação Nacional de Agroecologia • Lindiwe 	Kojo Amanor, University of Ghana at Legon / FAC – Ghana

	role for South-South Cooperation?	agendas on sustainability), inclusive green growth and climate change mitigation – climate-smart agriculture and the socio-environmental lesson-learning process from Brazilian agricultural development. What lessons exist from including rural women for example? How can we do better rather than simply produce more?		Sibanda, FARNPAN • Justina Ines Cima, Movimento das Mulheres Camponesas	
15:15	Coffee break				
15:30	Panel 3 Brazil and China in Africa: Similarities and differences in South-South exchange	Identifying contrasts and commonalities in Brazilian and Chinese approaches to agricultural development cooperation with Africa, and potential for future exchange – what might Brazil and China do together?	Alex Shankland, IDS / FAC	• Qi Gubo, Chinese Agricultural University • Paulo Esteves, BRICS Policy Centre Brazil • Frédéric Goulet, CIRAD	Sérgio Chichava, IESE / FAC – Mozambique
16:45	Closing	To what extent is Brazilian agricultural cooperation currently meeting the challenges and responding to demand? African and Brazilian perspectives on key issues for follow-up and future dialogue – what would an effective cooperation process look like?	Lídia Cabral, ODI / FAC	• Blessings Chinsinga, FAC – Malawi • Iara Costa Leite, Articulação Sul	

List of participants

	Institution	Name of Participant	Title	City or Country	Role
1	ABC – Brazilian Cooperation Agency	Alexandre Prestes Silveira	Coordenador-Geral, Gerência de África, Ásia e Oceania	Brasilia	Participant
2	ABC – Brazilian Cooperation Agency	Frederico Dimas de Paiva	Coordenador do Programa ProSavana	Brasilia	Participant
3	ABC – Brazilian Cooperation Agency	Minister Marco Farani	Director	Brasilia	Speaker (Opening session)
4	ABC – Brazilian Cooperation Agency	Pedro Veloso	Gerente, Cooperação Bilateral (Cotton 4 e Africa Francófona)	Brasilia	Participant
5	ABONG - Associação Brasileira de Organizações Não-Governamentais	Luara Lopes	Responsável pelo setor internacional	São Paulo	Participant
6	ActionAid Brazil	Elisa Hugueney	Country Director	Rio de Janeiro	Speaker (Panel 1)
7	Articulação de Mulheres do Amazonas e parte do Movimento Indígena do Amazonas	Jomar Araci dos Passos Amaral	Coordenadora	Manaus	Participant
8	Articulação SUL – Centro de Estudos e Articulação da Cooperação Sul-Sul	Bianca Suyama	Researcher	São Paulo	Organizer
9	Articulação SUL – Centro de Estudos e Articulação da Cooperação Sul-Sul	Iara Costa Leite	Researcher	Brazil	Organizer, Speaker (Closing session)
10	AS-PTA - Agroecologia e Agricultura Familiar, ANA - Articulação Nacional de Agroecologia	Jean Marc von der Weid	Coordenador do Programa de Políticas Públicas da AS-PTA Agroecologia e Agricultura Familiar	Rio de Janeiro	Speaker (Panel 2)
11	AWAN - African Women Agribusiness Network	Clara Ancilla Ibihya		Dar es Salaam, Tanzania	International Participant
12	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation's Global Development Program	Brady Walkinshaw	Associate Program Officer and Policy Analyst	Seattle, US	International Participant
13	BNDES - Banco Nacional de Desenvolvimento Econômico e Social	Jorge Arbache	Assessor do Presidente do BNDES e Professor da UnB	Brasilia	Participant
14	BRICS Policy Center	Paulo Esteves	Coordenador do Núcleo Cooperação Técnica e Ciência e Tecnologia	Rio de Janeiro	Speaker (Panel 3)
15	Câmara dos Deputados	Janete Rocha Pietá	Deputadora Federal (SP)	Brasilia	Participant

16	CENT - Center for Research on Transformation, and the Science and Technology Policy Research Unit, University of Sussex, United Kingdom	Anabel Marin	Research Fellow	Buenos Aires, Argentina	International Participant
17	Centro Feminista de Estudos e Assessoria	Guacira César de Oliveira	Diretora	Brasilia	Participant
18	China Agricultural University	Qi Gubo	Professor and Director, Rural Development and Management Programme, College of Humanities and Development Studies	Beijing, China	Speaker (Panel 3)
19	CIRAD – International Centre for Agricultural Research and Development	Bernard Mallet	Directeur Régional du Cirad au Brésil	Brasilia	Participant
20	CIRAD – International Centre for Agricultural Research and Development	Frédéric Goulet	Département Environnements et Sociétés (ES), UMR Innovation	France	Speaker (Panel 3)
21	CONAB - Companhia Nacional de Abastecimento (National Company of Food Supply)	Kelma C. Melo dos Santos Cruz	Engenheira agrônoma	Brasilia	Participant
22	CONAB - Companhia Nacional de Abastecimento (National Company of Food Supply)	Silvio Isoppo Porto	Diretor de Política Agrícola e Informações	Brasilia	Participant
23	Consea - Conselho Nacional de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional	Maria Emília Lisboa Pacheco	Conselho Nacional de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional	Rio de Janeiro	Participant
24	DFID Brazil	Daniel Bradley	First Secretary for Climate and Development in Brazil	Brasilia	Organizer, Speaker (Opening session)
25	DFID Brazil	Marcia Seimetz	Development Assistant	Brasilia	Participant
26	DFID Brazil	Michael Ellis	First Secretary	Brasilia	Participant
27	EMATER - Empresa de Assistência Técnica e Extensão Rural - Distrito Federal	Blaiton Carvalho da Silva	Extensionista Rural	Brasilia	Participant
28	EMATER - Empresa de Assistência Técnica e Extensão Rural - Distrito Federal	Marcelo Pereira	Gerente de Contratos e Convênios	Brasilia	Participant
29	Embassy of Ethiopia	Araya Kidane	Minister	Brasilia	Participant
30	Embassy of Ethiopia	Wuletaw Hailemariam Nigussie	Ambassador	Brasilia	Participant

31	Embassy of France	Marina Felli	Attachée de coopération technique	Brasilia	Participant
32	Embassy of the Gabonese Republic	Jérôme Angouo	Ambassador	Brasilia	Participant
33	Embassy of the People's Republic of China	Li Jinzhang	Ambassador	Brasilia	Participant
34	Embassy of the People's Republic of China	Yan Shupeng	Second Secretary	Brasilia	Participant
35	Embassy of the Republic of Benin	Isidore Monsi	Ambassador	Brasilia	Participant
36	Embassy of the Republic of Benin	Raphael Mensah	Minister Counsellor and Rio+20 Focal Point	Brasilia	Participant
37	Embassy of the Republic of Cabo Verde	Daniel António Pereira	Ambassador	Brasilia	Participant
38	Embassy of the Republic of Cameroon	Martin Agbor Mbeng	Ambassador	Brasilia	Participant
39	Embassy of the Republic of Congo	Aimé Clovis Guillond	Minister-Counsellor	Brasilia	Participant
40	Embassy of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea	Lázaro Ekua Avomo	Second Secretary	Brasilia	Participant
41	Embassy of the Republic of Guinea	Kélétiogui Fama Touré	Counsellor	Brasilia	Participant
42	Embassy of the Republic of Guinea	Mohamed Youlad	Ambassador	Brasilia	Participant
43	Embassy of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau	Jorge Luis Mendes	First Secretary	Brasilia	Participant
44	Embassy of the Republic of Kenya	Glenns T. Ekisa Etyang	Third Secretary	Brasilia	Participant
45	Embassy of the Republic of Kenya	Peter Kirimi Kaberia	Ambassador	Brasilia	Participant
46	Embassy of the Republic of Senegal	El Hadji Abdoul Aziz Ndiaye	Ambassador	Brasilia	Participant
47	Embassy of the Republic of Sudan	Abdelaziz Hassan Salih Taha	Minister	Brasilia	Participant
48	Embrapa - Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária	André Nepomuceno Dusi	Coordenador de Projetos Estruturantes da Secretaria de Relações Internacionais da Embrapa	Brasilia	Speaker (Panel 1)
49	Embrapa - Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária	Paulo Eduardo de Melo	Chefe-Adjunto	Brasilia	Participant
50	Embrapa Hortaliças (Embrapa Vegetables)	Edson Guiducci Filho	Sociologia Rural (Rural Sociology)	Brasilia	Participant
51	FAC - Ghana	Kojo Amanor	Associate Professor, Institute of African Studies, University of Ghana, Legon	Ghana	Discussant (Panel 2)
52	FAC - Malawi	Blessings Chinsinga	Associate Professor, Chancellor College, University of Malawi	Malawi	Speaker (Closing session)

53	FAC - Mozambique	Sérgio Chichava	Political scientist, Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Económicos (IESE) in Maputo	Mozambique	Discussant (Panel 3)
54	FAC - Zimbabwe	Langton Mukwereza	Research and Development Trust	Zimbabwe	Discussant (Panel 1)
55	Federação Quilombola de Minas Gerais N`Golo	Sandra Maria da Silva	Presidente da Federação Quilombola	Minas Gerais N`Golo	Participant
56	Gaia Social	Erica S Zanotti	Coordenadora de Projetos	Campinas	Participant
57	Ghanian Embassy	Kojo Assan	Minister	Brasilia	Participant
58	Ghanian Embassy	Wallace Agbi Gbedemah	Ambassador	Brasilia	Participant
59	ICTSD - International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development	Ammad Bahalim	Research Fellow	Geneva	International Participant
60	IDS – Institute of Development Studies	Alex Shankland	Research Fellow, Participation, Power and Social Change Team Co-convenor, IDS BRICS Initiative Institute of Development Studies University of Sussex	UK	Organizer and Chair (Panel 3)
61	IICA - Instituto Interamericano de Cooperação para a Agricultura	Cristina Costa Bernardi	Engenheiros agrônomos	Brasilia	Participant
62	IIED - International Institute for Environment and Development	Lila Buckley	Research Fellow	UK	International Participant
63	INTA - National Institute of Agricultural Technology	Elena Hidalgo de Ávila	Sociologist, specializing in rural and human development, research and extension, and Coordinator of the Pro-Huerta Program in San Juan Province.	Buenos Aires	International Participant
64	IPC-IG	André Lyra	IT Management Unit	Brasilia	Participant
65	IPC-IG	Cecilia Amaral	Communications, Outreach and Advocacy Unit	Brasilia	Communications support
66	IPC-IG	Daniela Rühl	Inclusive Growth Unit	Brasilia	Participant
67	IPC-IG	Fabiane Flesch	Operations and Management Unit	Brasilia	Administrative support
68	IPC-IG	Gaia Paradiso	Communications, Outreach and Advocacy Unit	Brasilia	Communications support
69	IPC-IG	Giselle Miguens	Communications, Outreach and Advocacy Unit	Brasilia	Communications support
70	IPC-IG	Jan Lammens	Inclusive Growth Unit	Brasilia	Participant
71	IPC-IG	Josique Lorenzo	Intern, Rural and Sustainable Development Cluster	Brasilia	Organizer assistant
72	IPC-IG	Leisa Perch	Team leader of Rural and Sustainable Development Cluster	Brasilia	Organizer and Chair (Panel 2)
73	IPC-IG	Pablo Burkolter	Consultant, Rural and Sustainable Development Cluster	Brasilia	Organizer
74	IPC-IG	Radhika Lal	Deputy Director	Brasilia	Participant

75	IPC-IG	Raquel Ramos	Inclusive Growth Unit	Brasilia	Participant
76	IPC-IG	Roberto Astorino	Publications Unit	Brasilia	Publications support
77	IPC-IG	Ryan Nehring	Employment, Social Protection and Cash Transfers Unit	Brasilia	Participant
78	IPC-IG	Tanya Wragg-Morris	Intern, Rural and Sustainable Development Cluster	Brasilia	Participant
79	IPC-IG	Thais Fernandes	Consultant, Rural and Sustainable Development Cluster	Brasilia	Participant
80	ISA - Instituto Socioambiental - Observatório Parlamentar Socioambiental	Lea Vaz Cardoso	Técnica em Desenvolvimento e Pesquisa Socioambiental - Eng. Agrônoma	Brasilia	Participant
81	JICA Brazil Office - Agência de Cooperação Internacional do Japão	Kobayashi Chiaki	Divisão Cooperação Triangular e Programas Sociais	Brasilia	Participant
82	MDA - Ministério de Desenvolvimento Agrário	Matheus Alves Zanella	Assessoria Internacional e de Promoção Comercial	Brasilia	Participant
83	MDA – Ministério do Desenvolvimento Agrário	Francesco Maria Pierri	Chefe da Assessoria para Assuntos Internacionais e de Promoção Comercial (AIPC)	Brasilia	Speaker (Panel 1)
84	MDA – Ministério do Desenvolvimento Agrário	Gabriel Leão Oliveira	Consultor do Mais Alimentos	Brasilia	Participant
85	MDA – Ministério do Desenvolvimento Agrário	Thomas Patriota	Assessor Internacional	Brasilia	Participant
86	MDS - Ministério do Desenvolvimento Social	Aline Ribeiro Dantas de Teixeira Soares	Chefe da Assessoria Internacional	Brasilia	Participant
87	Ministry of Planning, Budget and Management	Rafael Ranieri	Assessor Técnico na Coordenação-Geral de Relacionamento com Organismos Internacionais, da Secretaria de Assuntos Internacionais	Brasilia	Participant
88	Ministry of Planning, Budget and Management	Raquel Porto Ribeiro Mendes	Secretariat of International Affairs of the Ministry of Planning:	Brasilia	Participant
89	Movimento das Mulheres Camponesas	Justina Ines Cima	Coordenadora da Direção Nacional do Movimento das Mulheres Camponesas (MMC)	Brasilia	Speaker (Panel 2)
90	MPA - Movimento dos Pequenos Agricultores/ Via Campesina	Gilberto Schneider	Represente do Movimentos dos Pequenos Agricultores (MPA)/Via Campesina Brasil	Brasilia	Participant
91	MRE - Ministério das Relações Exteriores	Ministro Milton Rondo	Coordenador-Geral de Ações Internacionais de Combate à Fome	Brasilia	Speaker (Panel 1)

92	ODI – Overseas Development Institute	Lidia Cabral	Research Associate, Economist and Social Scientist, focus on SSC and public policy and aid management in the agriculture sector	Portugal	Organizer, Speaker (Opening session), and Chair (Closing session)
93	Oxfam International	Carlos Aguilar	Coordenador Programa BRICSAM-G20	Brasilia	Participant
94	Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro	Geovana Zoccal Gomes		Rio de Janeiro	Participant
95	SAE - Assessoria Internacional da Secretaria de Assuntos Estratégicos da Presidência da República	Ana Patrícia de Ramos Barros	Assessoria Internacional	Brasilia	Participant
96	SAIIA - South African Institute of International Affairs	Ana Alves	Senior Researcher, Global Powers and Africa Programme	Braamfontein, South Africa	Participant
97	Secretaria general da Presidencia	Maria Cristina Sampaio Lopes	Assessor	Brasilia	Participant
98	SENAR - Serviço Nacional de Aprendizagem Rural	Victor Rodrigues Ferreira	Assessor técnico do SENAR Administração Central	Brasilia	Participant
99	Swiss Embassy in Brazil	Wilhelm Meier	Ambassador	Brasilia	Participant
100	UFABC/Cebrap – Brazilian Centre for Analysis and Planning	Arilson da Silva Favareto	Professor of Economics and Sociology at the Federal University of ABC Region (UFABC); and researcher at the Brazilian Centre of Analysis and Planning (Cebrap)	São Paulo	Chair (Panel 1)
101	UN Women	Eunice Borges	Ponto Focal para o fundo MDG	Brasilia	Participant
102	UN Women	Miren Saiz Alzugaray	Assistente de Programa	Brasilia	Participant
103	UN Women	Rebecca Reichmann Tavares	Representative/Regional Programme Director	Brasilia	Participant
104	UnB - Centro de Desenvolvimento Sustentável	Doris Sayago	Profesora	Brasilia	Participant
105	UNDP/IPC-IG	Daniel Furst Gonçalves	Analista de Programa de Cooperação Sul-Sul	Brasilia	Participant
106	UNDP/IPC-IG	Jorge Chediek	UNDP Resident Representative and UN Resident Coordinator in Brazil; IPC-IG's Interim Director	Brasilia	Chair (Opening Session)
107	UNECA - United Nations Economic Commission for Africa - African Climate Policy Centre	Tom Owiyo	Senior Agriculture and Climate Change Specialist	Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	Speaker (Opening session)

108	Unilab - Universidade de Integração Internacional da Lusofonia Afro-brasileira	Joana Amaral	Assessora do Reitor Paulo Speller	Fortaleza	Participant
109	Unilab - Universidade de Integração Internacional da Lusofonia Afro-brasileira	Paulo Speller	Reitor	Fortaleza	Participant
110	USAID	Alexandre Mancuso	Programme Officer (trilateral cooperation)	Brasilia	Participant
111	WFP - World Food Programme, Centro de Excelência Contra a Fome	Mariana Hoffmann	Communications Consultant	Brasilia	Participant
112	WFP - World Food Programme, Centro de Excelência Contra a Fome	Darana Souza	Programme Officer	Brasilia	Speaker (Panel 2)
113	World Bank	Boris Utria	Country Operations Adviser	Brazil	Participant