



# Key Messages and Recommendations

## 1. Introduction

From the 26 – 28 of August 2015, the Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN) convened a multi-stakeholder regional policy dialogue focused on Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) under the theme “*Creating an Enabling Environment for Scaling up Climate Smart Agriculture: The Road to Paris*” in Lusaka, Zambia.

Days one and two of the regional policy dialogue were dedicated to lesson sharing and discussions on how to scale up CSA whilst day three focused on the Management of Climate-Related Risks to Crop Production and Post-Harvest Losses and reduction of Aflatoxin in the Groundnut Value Chain (GnVC).

The 2015 CSA regional policy dialogue was held three months before the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Paris, France in December 2015. Against this backdrop, the 2015 CSA regional policy dialogue brought together African CSA stakeholders to concretise a unified African position on agriculture ahead of COP 21. More so because agriculture and land use will be of critical importance in the negotiations at COP 21 to ensure food and nutrition security and economic growth of the African continent.

## 2. Evidence on why unified African position on agriculture ahead of COP 21

### The problem is that:

1. *Rainfall patterns would shift - Northern and southern Africa will become much drier with precipitation falling by 15% or more;*
2. *Heat extremes would occur more often - Northern and southern Africa will become much hotter with as much as 4 °C or more;*
3. *Dry, arid regions would spread; and*
4. *Sea-level would rise - a rise of about half a metre by the end of this century.*

### This is important because for African agriculture and food and nutrition security:

1. *Farmers would see lower crop yields;*
2. *Farmers would also lose arable land;*
3. *Less food would be available to eat; and*
4. *Malnutrition would also increase.*



### 3. Policy recommendations for advocating CSA policies at regional level

The 2015 CSA regional policy dialogue attended by 102 delegates from 17 FANRPAN member countries including Zambian delegates produced 28 recommendations as follows:

#### 3.1. *From Policy to Practice:*

- 3.1.1. CSA policies should be evidence-based and policy-making processes should be participatory and encompass ideas from other related sectors.
- 3.1.2. There is diversity in the understanding and definitions of CSA; therefore, CSA body of knowledge requires a universal definition to enhance common understanding.
- 3.1.3. Real issues affecting farming communities should inform the research agenda and research findings have to be validated by and reported back to these farming communities.
- 3.1.4. Policies not accompanied by clear regulatory, implementation and cost effective instruments are not adequate.
- 3.1.5. The CSA policymaking process should be based on real participation by all stakeholders affected by challenges arising from climate change.
- 3.1.6. There is need to identify and work with policy champions who speak the same political language; have the right networks; and can speed-up positive policy change.

#### 3.2. *Innovations and Technology Transfer*

- 3.2.1. Adoption of technologies takes time – CSA is one such technology; therefore, there is a need to do a cost-benefit analysis to demonstrate potential return on investment.
- 3.2.2. It is important to demonstrate which CSA interventions have worked, where and why.
- 3.2.3. There is need to strengthen the rural advisory and extension services in Africa so that the extension officers and agents support the adoption of technologies by African smallholder farmers.
- 3.2.4. It is important to consider how the agricultural sector can rehabilitate old innovations and technologies, in Africa, many irrigation schemes are dilapidated, and there is an urgent need rehabilitate them.

#### 3.3. *Strengthening the Capacity (i.e., Research and Training)*

- 3.3.1. Moving from theory to practice, there is a need for research studies to build on the already existing body of CSA knowledge and prioritise innovations that can be up-scaled and out-scaled.
- 3.3.2. More collaborative research is needed to maximise on resources especially amongst researchers and scientists in Africa.
- 3.3.3. Research should take into account the important role that indigenous knowledge can play in increasing the adoption of Climate Smart Agriculture.
- 3.3.4. There is need for consistent capacity building in the area of climate change/climate smart agriculture to allow Africa to understand the sciences and complexities of it. Moreover, farmers should be empowered to advocate for CSA initiatives and to influence policy.
- 3.3.5. Agriculture training and/or educational programmes should mainstream CSA in their curricula. In addition, to support mainstreaming of CSA, there is need to have specific CSA knowledge centres.



### 3.4. Domestic Climate Financing

- 3.4.1. Countries should develop and establish a well-coordinated registry that would coordinate the different forms of public and private climate finance inflow in the countries.
- 3.4.2. Public and private partnerships are imperative with regards to galvanising climate finance.
- 3.4.3. There is need to put into place mechanisms that can help track the implementation of CSA activities as part of broader agriculture policies; this should include climate financing.
- 3.4.4. There is need to build the capacity of African institutions to be able to absorb funding that comes through ring fencing for African countries so that countries do not return the money unused.

### 3.5. Communicating CSA messages

- 3.5.1. Develop (i) tailored messages based on the audience needs; (ii) innovative communication tools for different stakeholders; and (iii) feedback mechanisms to make it a two-way communication.
- 3.5.2. Bridging of the existing communication gap cannot happen without communication specialists understanding the science of CSA. To bridge the communication gap, these can be development, online, and/or behavioural change communication specialists.

### 3.6. Stemming Aflatoxin in the groundnut value chain

- 3.6.1. Develop policy frameworks that encourage and promote the participation of entrepreneurs along the groundnuts value chain with a specific bias to reducing PHL and improved market access.
- 3.6.2. An integrated approach throughout the groundnut value chain is required to stem aflatoxin contamination in Africa. Collaborative multi-stakeholder partnerships are critical.
- 3.6.3. There is a need for increased funding by governments and development partners for the establishment and enforcement of standards. These standards should be at par with the international standards on aflatoxin control.
- 3.6.4. Research and development should be a key pillar in reducing aflatoxin contamination. Conventional research should take into account the traditional knowledge on aflatoxin control.

### 3.7. Climate risks to crop production and post-harvest handling

- 3.7.1. Establish and promote multi stakeholder engagements, communication and knowledge platforms that promote the adoption of profitable post-harvest loss management technologies.
- 3.7.2. Establish national and sectoral climate change policy that is not general but specific, ensuring effective participation and engagement of stakeholders at national and sectoral level.
- 3.7.3. Promote concrete efforts at developing institutional and policy environment that would be more focused on smallholder climate change risk mitigating strategies.



## 4. Concretised and unified position on African Agriculture for the COP 21

The 2015 High Level CSA Regional Policy Dialogue presents that African negotiators should concentrate on a package ***deal that acknowledges the following:***

- 4.1. Agriculture is central to African countries' economies; therefore, there is a need for tailor-made financing mechanisms for Africa.
- 4.2. Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) and national investment plans should define the need for Africa and should provide the basis of investment priorities.
- 4.3. African countries are diverse and are at different levels; however, Africa should still present a unified voice advocating for agriculture to be central to the negotiations.
- 4.4. Calls for urgency and immediate actions, as the COP 21 processes of the UNFCCC has been dragging. The UNFCCC entered into force on 21 March 1994 and the first COP took place in Berlin in 1995.
- 4.5. The African position is and has been guided by scientific evidence from, amongst others, the fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

The ***key messages***, for the negotiators and Africa CSA champions, amongst others, to COP 21 are:

- 4.6. For Africa, CSA has been identified as offering triple wins for food security, adaptation and mitigation.
- 4.7. Climate change is emerging as a major challenge to agriculture development in Africa, therefore a deal with "No agriculture is a No deal".
- 4.8. Climate change finance should be clearly delineated from other forms of development assistance to Africa. This will allow transparency, accountability and easier monitoring and evaluation to enhance greater impact.
- 4.9. There is a need to build human and institutional capacities towards a knowledge economy that supports innovation, research and development; that is, invest in climate services in ways that will leverage the potential of Africa, as majority of farmers and a range of people are dependent on agriculture and natural resource assets.
- 4.10. Climate change does not only affect production levels, it also increases post-harvest losses due to diseases and pest, significantly reducing income derived from agriculture by African rural farming families.
- 4.11. Africa, requests that the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) for developed countries should take account of adaptation and mitigation measures. These should be fair, ambitious and transparent to meet their mandate as outlined in Article 2 of the convention. In this we have noted that, developed nations will donate 1% of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) to developing nations to bridge the development gap; however, this promise is not honoured as indicated by the current average of 0.3%.

