Building partnerships with whom?

Quick scan of the key actors in food security Public-Private Partnerships

Food & Business
Knowledge Platform

Report

Building partnerships with whom?

Quick scan of the key actors in food security Public-Private Partnerships

May 2015

Authors

Evert-jan Quak and Nicole Metz (F&BKP)

Food & Business Knowledge Platform

Bezuidenhoutseweg 2
2594 AV The Hague
The Netherlands
T: +31 (0)70 3043 754
E: info@knowledge4food.net
W: www.knowledge4food.net
Tw: @foodplatform

Table of Contents

Terminology

On the use of the terms 'Public-Private Partnerships' (PPPs) and 'Multi-stakeholder partnerships':
This paper uses both the terms PPPs and multi-stakeholder partnerships. In the literature multi-stakeholder partnerships are understood as a synonym for PPPs. The Food & Business Knowledge Platform decided to use both terms because this paper refers to different partnership initiatives that each make use of and are commonly known by both terms. For example, the Dutch government prefers to refer to PPPs in its communication, especially regarding its partnership programmes in food security. However, the partnership model of the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition is better known as a multi-stakeholder partnership. For an introduction on PPPs see 'Public-Private Partnerships: a brief introduction', a publication of the PPPLab in its Insight Series.

The definition for PPPs and multi-stakeholder partnerships used in this paper: Alliances between parties drawn from government, business and civil society (sometimes also knowledge institutes are main parties) that strategically aggregate the resources and competencies of each party to resolve the key challenges of food security and which are founded on principles of shared risk, cost and mutual benefit.

Abbreviations

AfDB	African Development Bank
AGRA	Alliance for a Green Revolution for Africa
ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa
CAADP	Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme
CCARDESA	Centre for Coordination of Agricultural Research and Development for Southern Africa
CGIAR	Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CORAF/WECARD	Conseil Ouest et Centre Africain pour la Recherche et le Développement Agricole / West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development
DfID	UK Department for International Development
DGIS	Directoraat-generaal Internationale Samenwerking (Directorate General for International Co-operation), Netherlands
DIE	Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (German Development Institute)
ECDPM	European Centre for Development Policy Management
ESAFF	Eastern and Southern Africa Small Scale Farmers' Forum
FDOV	Faciliteit Duurzaam Ondernemen en Voedselzekerheid (Facility for Sustainable Entrepreneurship and Food Security), Netherlands
FDW	Fonds Duurzaam Water (Sustainable Water Fund), Netherlands
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IOB	Inspectie Ontwikkelingssamenwerking en Beleidsevaluatie (Policy and Operations Evaluation Department, Netherlands)
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development

NES	Nuclear Estate and Smallholder
Norad	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
Norfund	Norwegian Investment Fund for Developing Countries
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
ODA	Overseas Development Aid
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
PPPs	Public-Private Partnerships
PSDA	Private Sector Development in Agriculture
RVO	Rijksdienst voor Ondernemend Nederland (Netherlands Enterprise Agency)
ROPPA	Réseau des Organisations Paysannes et des Producteurs Agricoles de l'Afrique de l'Ouest (Network of Farmers' and Agricultural Producers' Organizations of West Africa)
SACAU	Southern African Confederation of Agricultural Unions
SADA	Savannah Accelerated Development Authority
SMEs	Small and Medium Enterprises
WUR-CDI	Wageningen University and Research Centre – Centre for Development Innovation
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

Introduction

Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) in agriculture, food security and nutrition are on the rise. OECD countries and African governments invest more and more funds through PPPs to modernize the agricultural sector and food value chains in Africa. This paper presents a brief and non-exhaustive overview (a 'quick scan') of the players who are involved in the PPPs, from companies, civil society, inter-governmental organizations, farmer organizations, to knowledge institutes. The focus is on multi-stakeholder initiatives, in particular those that are established on an international level to improve food and nutrition security as well as catalyse and facilitate investments in the agricultural sector in Africa.

Image credit: CIMMYT

The road to a Dutch policy on Public-Private Partnerships

In the two decades preceding 2011, agriculture and food security were not among the priority sectors of Dutch and other OECD countries' development cooperation policies.[1] The share of overseas development aid (ODA) for agriculture globally fell by two-thirds between 1990 and 2006, to 4%. In the Netherlands, 3.4% of development aid was assigned to agriculture in 2008.[2]

But after the World Bank published its World Development Report 'Agriculture for Development' in 2008[3] and because of the food crisis of the same year, there was revived interest in agriculture as one of the key strategies for international cooperation. The share of ODA for agriculture in the Netherlands nearly doubled between 2008 and 2012 to 6.6%.[4] Along with a renewed focus on the agricultural sector, a surge in PPPs has emerged.

In 2011, food security was selected as one of the four priority themes of Dutch development policy, which would further build upon existing Dutch expertise and knowledge in this area.[5] Enhancing economic growth and resilience were and remain key policy objectives.[6] Creating economic opportunities both globally and in the Netherlands, in collaboration with Dutch businesses, has been an explicit policy focus since 2011.[7] The policy targeted four areas: extending sustainable food production, improved access to qualitative food, more efficient markets, and an improved enabling business environment.[8] In November 2014, a new policy letter on food security was sent to the Parliament, which highlights three goals: eradication of current hunger and under-nutrition, stimulating inclusive and sustainable growth in the agricultural sector, realisation of ecological food systems.[9] The letter was written by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Economic Affairs.[10]

PPPs play a major role in implementing Dutch development cooperation policy. Although there are many different partnership strategies and purposes,[11] a Dutch approach has emerged. The aim of the Dutch partnership model, as has been defined by the Dutch government, is to bring together the government, businesses, research institutions and civil society organizations and to encourage economic development through market-oriented investment and thus to contribute to poverty reduction in developing countries.[12] This model is also known as the Dutch Diamond Approach. According to the Dutch government such a partnership model 'enables knowledge, expertise and financing to be pooled. The private sector's efficient, market-oriented approach is coupled with civil society organizations' knowledge of local circumstances. The research institutions contribute expertise. And the government brings the parties together and co-finances the partnership.'[13]

Several funds were established within the Public-Private Partnership Facility of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, targeting investments in water safety, food security and business development, and healthcare in developing countries.[14] The Facility for Sustainable Entrepreneurship and Food Security (FDOV) granted 85 million euros in a first round of 2012 to 29 partnerships. It will grant another 40 million euros in the second round in 2015.

Aside from the subsidy, applicants and partners must generate the same amount of money from their own contribution. The Netherlands Enterprise Agency (RVO) is responsible for managing these funds.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has set up an expertise centre to pool knowledge and expertise in relation to PPPs in order to learn from the experiences, to understand the local impact of PPPs on development, and to improve PPPs. The expertise centre is responsible for making overarching PPP policy, drawing lessons from experience of PPPs, and internal coordination. In 2013, the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs published a study on the impact of PPPs on development.[15] It concluded that there are few diagnostic tools available to determine when and how PPPs represent a preferred institutional arrangement. The IOB study mentions the scarce evidence on the effectiveness and efficiency of PPP arrangements and the lack of focus in PPP evaluations on risk sharing and revenue distribution. As part of the additional learning process on PPPs, a 4-year program named “PPPLab” has been funded by DGIS for action research and knowledge development and sharing on the relevance, effectiveness and quality of Dutch supported PPPs.[16]

Global trends in multi-stakeholder initiatives

The Dutch government is also a main player at the international level to promote and establish multi-stakeholder initiatives on food security and agriculture. And it is not alone. The change within the Dutch policy towards PPPs can be seen within a broader global trend to bridge the gap between the public and the private sector domains in the area of food security. Globally, governments are increasingly committing resources to further the use of PPPs. The OECD estimates that, in 2010, donors channelled US$903m in aid into PPPs, a significant increase from US$234m in 2007.[17]

A significant example of this trend is The New Vision for Agriculture defined by the World Economic Forum partners in 2009. It sets goals on improving and integrating food security with environmental sustainability and economic opportunity.[18] According to their website the World Economic Forum’s New Vision for Agriculture initiative has engaged over 350 organizations (companies, civil society, producer organizations, knowledge institutes, governments) in its work to strengthen collaboration and combine public and private funds to catalyse agricultural investment and local partnership programmes.[19] At a global level, it has partnered with the G20 in 2011-2012 and with the G7/8 in 2012-2014. Additionally, the New Vision for Agriculture initiative also established the Transformation Leaders Network which engages over 120 action leaders and experts with the aim to enhance the impact of its partnerships, promote leadership development and strengthen multi-stakeholder collaboration.

At the regional and country level, the New Vision for Agriculture has catalysed multi-stakeholder partnerships in 16 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America; it established a regional partnership in Africa (GROW Africa, which was founded in June 2011 by the African Union, New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD)[20] and the World Economic Forum)[21] and Asia (GROW Asia, which was initiated by the World Economic Forum in collaboration with the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) Secretariat)[22] and country partnerships in Mexico (VIDA)[23] and India (Maharashtra partnership)[24]. The four regional and country level multi-stakeholder partnerships initiated many specific partnership activities around commodity markets and value chains in the 16 countries.[25] All four macro-level partnership programmes are led and driven by the host governments together with local and global stakeholders. Representatives of each partnership are engaged in the New Vision for Agriculture’s Transformation Leaders Network.

According to the website of the World Economic Forum, these efforts have together mobilized over US$10 billion in investment commitments, of which US$1.2 billion has been implemented, reaching over 3.6 million smallholder farmers.[26]

On the strategic and policy level another actor of key relevance for partnership development on food security was established. The New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition was initiated by the G8 in 2012.[27] The New Alliance focuses on the African continent and has been signed by ten countries – the same countries as GROW Africa, except Rwanda and Kenya which are not partners in the New Alliance, and it includes Benin and Senegal which are not partners in GROW Africa.[28] The alliance is based on the political commitment of the countries’ governments to drive effective national plans and policies for food security and to mobilise large companies to increase investment. The countries agree to accelerate the implementation of key components of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) and leverage the potential of private investments by establishing PPPs.[29]

To link the New Alliance with the commitments made in GROW Africa, a Leadership Council was formed in 2012. This committed to realizing the investment commitments pledged by the companies, governments and development partners within the New Alliance and GROW Africa. It consists of high-level representatives from

African governments, development partners, African and multinational corporations, civil society, and farmers' organizations that monitor, support and advance progress.[30] In 2014, the Leadership Council was led by the African Union Commission, World Economic Forum, and the United States Government.

Other important multi-stakeholder partnership initiatives on a macro-level that saw the light after the New Vision for Agriculture, are the African Agricultural Growth Corridor Programmes in Tanzania (the Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania, or SAGCOT), Ghana (the Ghana Commercial Agriculture Project, or GCAP), Malawi (the Green Belt Initiative, or GBI), Burkina Faso (the Bagré Growth Pole) and Mozambique (the Beira Agricultural Growth Corridor and Nacala Growth Poles). The growth corridor programmes are multi-stakeholder partnerships to rapidly develop the region's agricultural potential with investments in infrastructure. SAGCOT, for example, was initiated at the World Economic Forum (WEF) Africa summit of 2010 with the support of WEF founding partners including farmers, agri-business and the Government of Tanzania.

Image credit: [World Economic Forum]

OECD governments are committing substantial resources to such macro-level PPPs. For example, the international community has committed over US$5.9bn of multi-annual ODA to further the aims of the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition in the ten African states. While many investments are yet to be realized at the project level, OECD countries have committed nearly US$1.5bn of ODA in grants and concessionary loans to support growth corridors partnerships.[31]

Although there is not one PPP model, the common aim is to let large companies from OECD countries, from developing countries, and from emerging economies (e.g., China, India, Brazil, Arab countries) invest more in the agricultural and food sector of developing countries, in particular in Africa. By setting up a multi-stakeholder partnership programme on the macro-level with clear goals and by defining different roles and sharing responsibilities between different sectors, actors and stakeholders the idea is that this will lead to many specific partnership programmes within the region[32]. By doing so, according to the websites of the multi-stakeholder partnerships that are mentioned above, they achieve greater impact in an efficient manner making use of the assets and expertise of the different stakeholders involved.[33] PPPs are also expected to generate an innovative form of governance that addresses deficits of (inter-)state politics by bringing together key actors of civil society, governments and business. In this perspective, partnerships for sustainable development are important mechanisms to help resolve a variety of current governance deficits.[34]

Partnering with whom?

Although activities initiated by macro-level multi-stakeholder partnerships differ, the main parties involved are national governments particularly in Africa, OECD countries' governments, multilateral institutions, and international corporations. The multi-stakeholder partnership initiatives in the agricultural and food sector are mainly issued by intergovernmental organizations and global platforms (G8, G20, WEF) and are backed and co-financed by governments in OECD countries (the most involved are the UK, USA, Netherlands, Japan, Norway, New Zealand, Australia, Germany and Switzerland).

These OECD countries' governments, and multilateral institutions like the World Bank, play a supportive role by providing 'patient capital'[35] for agricultural businesses. They also tend to support 'catalytic funding' arrangements to provide matching grants to national or international businesses wishing to invest in the PPP target zones. They support knowledge exchange and brokering arrangements to include civil society actors and knowledge institutes. The financial support of these governments and multilateral institutions aims to reduce operational and capital costs, especially for large companies that, for example, are willing to expand collaboration with smallholders. They also help smallholder engagement activities, give administrative support or capacity building assistance for PPP governance, and facilitate investment agreements between investors and governments.

Governments in mainly Africa but also in Asia and their regional organizations (African Union, ASEAN) are involved to guarantee the investments channelled through PPPs are part of national and regional agricultural development plans. National governments in Africa have the role of creating a national development plan and framework of implementation for their agricultural sector. PPPs are established to invest in the implementation of the national frameworks. Additionally, the national governments have the role of creating enabling environments for effective agricultural value chains and investments and establishing PPP governance arrangements.

While the role of (international) companies is to guarantee investments within the target areas, they often have to agree to work with smallholders through mostly outgrowing or NES (nuclear estate and smallholder) business models.[36] The companies are also important actors for brokering international trade. International companies that are the main partners within these multi-stakeholder initiatives include corporations such as Nestlé, Unilever, Yara, Kraft, DuPont and Cargill.

Most of the corporations that are active in several multi-stakeholder partnerships are global member companies of the World Economic Forum. The New Vision for Agriculture, for example, is led by 31 of the World Economic Forum's global partner companies and IFC, 'in coordination with governments, civil society, international organizations, farmers associations, research institutions and many other stakeholders'. The companies involved represent the whole supply chain, from seeds, chemical inputs, production, processing, transport and trade, to supermarkets.[37] Yara, especially, is one of the main players that have stimulated partnership models for African agriculture. This global nitrogen fertiliser company from Norway (of which the Norwegian government is the largest shareholder) promoted both the African Agricultural Growth Corridors Partnerships and the GROW Africa Partnership.

Finally, while knowledge institutes are not involved in the aforementioned partnerships, to our knowledge, various international development organizations are. For example, World Wildlife Fund (WWF), International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) in environmental, forest and on livestock related partnerships. Oxfam is partner in the New Vision for Agriculture, but has decided to stop actively collaborating within the Leadership Council of the New Alliance.[38] Two main development players are also involved: AgDevCo and Prorustica. Prorustica is an international development consultancy based in the UK specialised in PPP models in agriculture. AgDevCo is a not for profit agricultural project development company that works as an investor to develop agriculture enterprises at an early stage. It counts AGRA, USAID, Rockefeller and DfID among its funding partners.

Image credit: Yara – Agricultural Growth Corridors

Box 1: Two cases

African Agricultural Growth Corridors Partnerships

After 2010 several large-scale partnership programs were initiated in Africa to invest in agricultural growth corridors with the aim to improve agricultural productivity, food security and livelihoods in Africa by upscaling investments in rural infrastructure and irrigation. Yara International, as one of the active members of the World Economic Forum, is one of the initiators of the African corridor partnerships. The two most well-known partnerships are the Beira Corridor of Mozambique and the Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania.

Companies that are partners for the Tanzania Corridor partnership include Monsanto, DuPont, Syngenta, Unilever, General Mills, Yara, Bayer, Nestlé and SAB Miller. For the Mozambique corridor they include DuPont, Vale, Rio Tinto, as well as several banks and companies with interests in sugar and in biofuels. Other strategic partners in most of the African Corridor partnerships are the Alliance for a Green Revolution for Africa (AGRA), NEPAD, World Bank and FAO and governments including the USA, UK, Norway and the Netherlands. Three investment companies are closely involved: AgDevCo, Prorustica and InfraCo. InfraCo focuses on the development of infrastructure services using funding from DfID to start up projects until private companies are willing to invest, with the stated aim of recovering that money later.

A closer look at the Beira Corridor Partnership in Mozambique shows that a total investment of US$1.7 billion is estimated to unlock the full potential of the region. However, this has not to be paid in full by its partnership members as the Beira Corridor partnership is based on the idea that patient capital in irrigation and infrastructure is needed to unlock the potential of the region to become an agricultural hub. InfraCo estimated that US$250 million of patient capital from the PPP members could induce private investment in the region of more than US$1billion. However, still most of the patient capital has to be agreed on.

To kick-start the Beira Corridor partnership, the governments of particularly the UK, Norway and the Netherlands have stepped in. DfID has provided an ‘Accountable Grant Arrangement’ of up to US$10 million through AgDevCo for the Beira Agricultural Growth Corridor partnership. The Norwegian government has committed US$1.85 million to InfraCo and AgDevCo, and the Dutch government has provided US$10 million to finance the Catalytic Fund for 3 years. The Catalytic Fund provides low-cost funding of US$50,000 to US$500,000 to eligible businesses. It is revolving facility and recipients must agree to enter into a joint venture with AgDevCo, the manager of the Catalytic Fund, to develop the business opportunity.

See Beira Corridor´s official website for more information.

See this EcoNexus report for a critical view on the corridor partnerships.

The New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition

Many of the actors in the African corridors partnerships are also involved within the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition. The World Economic Forum has been building up the Alliance during its WEF Africa meetings. The alliance is a commitment by G8 countries, African countries and private sector partners to lift 50 million people out of poverty over the coming ten years starting from its launch in 2012. According to the New Alliance Progress Report, in 2013, four additional countries (Benin, Malawi, Nigeria, and Senegal) developed Cooperation Frameworks, raising the level of planned private investment from US$3.7 billion to US$8 billion from 180 companies, two-thirds of which are based in Africa. Of the government policy commitments that were due by June 2014, 25 percent have been completed and 70 percent have demonstrated some progress. In addition, US$2.1 billion of the development partner commitments outlined in Cooperation Frameworks have been disbursed, reflecting 72 percent of the funding intentions expected to date.

The New Alliance involves the African Union, NEPAD, governments of Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, and Tanzania. Funding development partners include: Canada, the European Union, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. Other commitments come from African Development Bank, Belgium, Ireland, Norway, Switzerland and the Netherlands.

In addition to the funding developing partners, research institutions and other non-governmental and international organizations participate in the New Alliance as implementers of enabling actions. These organizations include the: African Development Bank, African Union Commission, Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA), Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA), Centre for Coordination of Agricultural Research and Development for Southern Africa (CCARDESA), West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development (CORAF/WECARD), CGIAR, Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa, Global Open Data for Agriculture and Nutrition, HarvestPlus, International Fund for Agricultural Development, International Food Policy Research Institute, International Labour Organization, Scaling Up Nutrition Movement, Semento Seed Consulting, University of California and the World Bank Group.

27 multinational companies signed letters of intent to establish projects on irrigation, processing, trading, financing and infrastructure, while 60 more have signed the Private Sector Declaration of Support for African Agricultural Development through responsible PPPs. Entities involved in the letters of intent include many of the aforementioned corporations: SAB Miller, Syngenta, Swiss Re, Cargill, Diageo, Unilever, DuPont, Monsanto, Vodafone and Yara. Signatories to the Declaration include some of the same corporations, plus Archer Daniels Midland, PepsiCo, BASF, Bayer, Kraft Foods and Novozymes.

The New Alliance involves civil society and farmers' organizations in its dialogue and consultation processes. In the Leadership Council in 2014 three African farmers' organizations and one civil society organization were members: Eastern Africa Farmers Federation, Oxfam America, Pan African Farmers Organization, ROPPA (Network of Farmers' and Agricultural Producers' Organizations of West Africa), Southern African Confederation of Agricultural Unions (SACAU). Since then, Oxfam has left the Leadership Council for political reasons.

Read the statement of Oxfam here

See the Progress Report 2013-14 of the New Alliance for Agriculture here

Who are the African partners?

African governments are important players within multi-stakeholder partnerships on the macro-level and their local 'off-shoot' partnership programs. Such partnerships are stimulated, for example, by the GROW Africa Partnership initiative and based on the CAADP. This is one of the programs of NEPAD, set up in 2003. It is designed to encourage coordinated national strategies and investment plans for agriculture among all African Union members.[39] As described above, NEPAD together with the African Union Commission and the World Economic Forum also established the GROW Africa Partnership Initiative.

The increase of PPPs throughout Africa by national governments (e.g., on value chain development, on productivity improvements for a single commodity) went hand in hand with the rise of national agencies to stimulate and facilitate national-led partnership programs. Take, for example, Ethiopia's Agricultural Transformation Agency that was set up by the Ethiopian government in 2010 to help Ministries, the private sector and other non-governmental partners to address the broader constraints of achieving agricultural productivity growth and food security, while working with smallholders.[40] The importance of PPPs can also be seen in the rise of PPP units all around the continent. Public-private partnership units are organizations set up with full or partial aid of the government to ensure that the skills needed to handle partnership programs are made available and clustered together within government. Such units enhance the capacity of government to successfully manage the risks associated with a growing number and value of PPPs. There are units in Kenya, Nigeria, Malawi, Mauritius, Ghana, South Africa and Uganda.[41]

The Africa Development Bank is also involved in stimulating the PPP model on the continent. The Private Sector Operations Department is a key player as a lender and advisor to regional member countries in supporting PPPs. It especially looks at India for good practice.[42] The AfDB signed in 2014 an agreement with India's government to adopt model agreements and legal documents associated with PPPs in that country to use in African nations. According to the AfDB, for more PPPs to emerge in Africa, their member countries need to improve the business environment and overcome constraints that exist, in particular 'inadequate legal and regulatory frameworks for PPPs' and 'lack of technical skills to manage PPP programs and projects'.[43] The AfDB foresees that a weak business environment threatens the legitimacy of PPPs and undermines efforts to develop the kinds of policy and legislative strategies that promote business development. By cooperating with India, the AfDB's aim is not only to attract more investments from India but also to implement the country's PPP model to improve the regulatory frameworks needed for PPPs – and by doing so it hopes to increase the chance to attract good and irreversible investment.

Some examples of multi-stakeholder partnerships based on specific value chains and supply chains in particular countries, which are implemented in the context of macro-level-led partnership models are the Ghana Grains Partnership (maize), the Tanzanian Agricultural Partnership (fertilizer supply chain) and the Malawi Agricultural Partnership (cotton and rice). The aim of the first partnership is to strengthen the market through improved infrastructure, closer collaboration and improved efficiency throughout the grain value chain.[44] The emphasis is on food crop production, especially maize. Along with the initiators Yara and local input provider Wienco, the partnership involves a variety of both public and private institutions: the Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund, farmers' associations, the Ghana Ministry of Food and Agriculture, commercial banks, output buyers and traders.

Such partnerships based on specific food commodities and supply chains are based around local stakeholders like companies, producer- and farmer organizations, traders, and investors. However, because they have been catalyzed by the macro-level led multi-stakeholder initiatives, there are always international companies, multilateral organizations, and foreign development agencies involved. For example, the Tanzanian Agricultural Partnership was mainly initiated by the Norwegian Investment Fund for Developing Countries (Norfund), the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad) and the Norwegian company Yara in cooperation with the Tanzanian authorities.

Are PPPs inclusive?

African farmers' organizations and African civil society organizations are involved in most PPP programmes. Also on the macro-level, large scale multi-stakeholder partnerships such as GROW Africa, the African Growth Corridors Partnerships and the New Alliance; farmers' organizations and civil society actors are members and hold positions on the boards. For example, in the Beira Corridor Partnerships, four farmer organizations are members with one representative on the board.[45] In addition, in 2014 the Leadership Council of the New Alliance included three African farmers' organizations and one civil society organization among its members. It most cases the development partners that fund the partnership programmes initially insist that the board of a partnership must statutorily include one or more members of farmers' organizations and non-governmental development organizations.

However, several critical voices from networks and organizations have emerged on the direction of Africa's agricultural development. They observe an elite group of players that is too closely involved in decision-making structures of PPPs. A letter of protest with the title 'Modernising African Agriculture: Who benefits?' was circulated in the spring of 2013 and was signed by five networks and nine organizations including the Eastern and Southern African Small Scale Farmers" Forum (ESAFF), La Via Campesina Africa, and the Network of Farmers' and Agricultural Producers' Organizations of West Africa (ROPPA).[46] They want an alternative model for investments in Africans' agricultural future, away from the current multi-stakeholder partnership programmes driven by corporate interests in which, according to them, there is too little real inclusion of smaller producers and farmers' interests.

In recent years some critical reports from Oxfam, Fair Trade Foundation, World Vision,[47] EcoNexus,[48] and the International Civil Society Center[49] were published that mention the same problems. They all highlight the need for genuine inclusiveness and transparency of PPP initiatives, in particular the ones functioning at macro-level, which include specific national-level partnerships within several developing countries. The main message of these studies is that inclusiveness and transparency should be a priority concern of all partners within multi-stakeholder initiatives, to ensure the interests of actors such as smallholders, local SMEs, local knowledge institutes, and grassroots civil society organizations. Although the goal to include local stakeholders has been expressed in all the aforementioned macro-level multi-stakeholder partnerships for food security and agriculture programmes, the critical reports show that they are still top-down driven, lack local ownership, and are based on one principle of smallholder engagement related to outgrowing and NES business models. They highlight a misbalance within such partnership programmes between the interests of smaller local stakeholders and bigger commercial players.

The Fairtrade Foundation published a study of four agricultural PPPs in Ghana, Malawi and Kenya, entitled 'A seat at the table?', which was based on field research results that were triangulated by reviewing and examining a broad range of secondary research, reports, data, analysis and documentation. It found examples of PPPs failing to engage effectively with smallholder farmers, making assumptions about farmers' needs while ignoring or overlooking their actual concerns and priorities, and treating farmers as beneficiaries rather than as equal partners.[50] It found few, if any, opportunities for farmers' representatives to sit around the table with governments, companies and other PPP stakeholders, or to influence the design or development of the PPPs that claim to improve their position. For example, the Ghana Commercial Agriculture Project, a US$145m framework PPP established by the Government of Ghana, World Bank and USAID, aims to increase productivity of smallholder farmers in the Accra Plains and SADA region, yet there had been just one occasion, in 2011, when smallholder farmers had an opportunity to express their views about it. The project takes a demand-driven approach, so funds are allocated according to large companies' applications rather than an assessment of farmers' needs.

The Oxfam Briefing Paper 'Moral Hazard? Mega Public-private partnerships in African agriculture', which is based on literature review, interviews, and three case studies in Burkina Faso, Malawi and Tanzania, also highlights that the current macro-level PPP projects, which Oxfam calls 'mega PPPs', need to revisit the fairness, transparency and accountability of these arrangements.[51] These reforms, according to Oxfam, should also aim to mitigate the 'moral hazard' in project design, meet the needs of local communities, and ensure a fair sharing of risks and benefits. It also mentions that on a smaller scale, locally initiated partnerships with companies and cross-sector collaborations can be usefully deployed to advance development objectives in agriculture. For example, challenge funds offer a useful mechanism to fund local enterprise development, and public bodies (represented by either governments or civil society organisations) play a positive role in linking farmers to markets. Such partnerships are not based on outgrowing principles and are bottom-up.

'Policy and financial support to producer organizations and informal women's production collectives allow smallholders to more effectively engage in markets by supporting easier access to inputs, reducing risk in financial transactions and giving them a stronger bargaining position in contract negotiations and policy formulation,' states the Oxfam report. Its recommendations aim to allow smallholders and their cooperatives to develop their own growth path independently from the interests of the small 'elite' group of stakeholders involved in macro-level led PPPs. Examples of smaller scale bottom-up partnership models are, according to the Oxfam report, DFID's Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund[52] and the R4 Rural Resilience Initiative[53].

Image credit: Amy Christian / Oxfam

However, there is another category of multi-stakeholder partnerships for agriculture. Important OECD countries, such as the United Kingdom, Germany, Canada, Australia, the Netherlands, and the United States among others, are not only investing in macro-level multi-stakeholder partnership initiatives, but are also developing and stimulating PPP initiatives for food security on their own, based on their own partnership models. An example is the aforementioned Dutch Diamond Approach for partnerships on which the FDOV is based on. The German Food Partnership is another example.

Although different from each other, the German Food Partnership and the Dutch FDOV approaches attract a far more diverse group of stakeholders that are willing to be involved in PPPs. In both the German and the Dutch partnership approaches, some of the big international players remain involved, especially in the German Food Partnership, which includes Bayer, Syngenta, and BASF.[54] The Dutch government granted partnerships with companies including Unilever, DSM, AKZO Nobel, PepsiCo, Yara, and Nestlé in its FDOV. They also engage many other partners that are not directly involved in macro-level PPPs. In Germany, for example, Solana, Riele, Pottinger, Grimme, Claas and Agco are partners. FDOV partnerships include the companies Achmea, RijkZwaan and Triodos Investment Management BV; the NGOs ICCO, Solidaridad; and the knowledge institutes Alterra and HAS Den Bosch.[55] As such, a much wider variety of voices and interests can also be included from the partners in the developing countries.

The obstacles that smaller players, such as NGOs, local businesses, knowledge institutes and their networks face to participate in the macro-level led PPPs are more profound than in PPPs models established by the development agencies of individual OECD countries. Being involved in the international arena within macro-level led partnerships asks a lot of capacity and specific knowledge from the stakeholders, which the smaller more local oriented companies, networks and organizations do not have or cannot afford. However, there are many challenges as well within the FDOV and German Food Partnership programmes. Therefore, more research is needed to show the exact obstacles for 'smaller-scale' actors to participate in OECD country initiated PPPs and how these new actors can improve the impact of PPPs for food security. For example, how inclusive are such PPPs for innovative small entrepreneurs in both developing and developed countries?[56]

Raising the bar for PPPs through knowledge

There has recently been a recognition that a next step in the evolution of PPPs is necessary, where all parties involved in partnerships cooperate to harness experience, develop projects and business plans, foster implementation, monitor and evaluate impact, and learn. For example, Canada's International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and the Syngenta Foundation for Sustainable Agriculture work on a PPP innovation platform to support the development of partnerships in agriculture by connecting them.[57] The British Partnering Initiative is also working on understanding existing partnerships and sharing experiences, best practices, and lessons learnt. On the European level, the EU-Working Group on Private Sector Development in Agriculture (PSDA) aims at more transparency in how and where the EU and the EU member states cooperate with companies. It also aims at analyzing and grouping the different approaches and recommending future orientation of the cooperation of the public sector with the private sector in agriculture.[58] In the Netherlands, the expertise centre of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the PPPLab as a learning facility for the FDOV and FDW can also be seen as a response to such needs.

The surge in PPPs and multi-stakeholder partnerships also saw an increase in the attention for lessons learned, getting PPP frameworks to work more effectively, and by publishing manuals of how to start and manage PPPs. There are courses for stakeholders to improve their skills to initiate, find finance, manage, and facilitate PPPs. Organizations like IP3 (Institute for Public-Private Partnership), PPP Experts, and The Partnering Institute are among many that organise training and courses. Knowledge through research is also on the rise within Universities and research institutes, by understanding the phenomenon and its trends. In the Netherlands there is the Partnership Resource Centre at the Erasmus University in Rotterdam, in Switzerland at the University of Geneva there is the PPP Research Centre, and many different business schools work on research in PPPs. Also development knowledge institutes such as ECDPM, ODI, and DIE, and universities such as the Wageningen University and Maastricht University in the Netherlands conduct lots of research into PPP approaches.

These knowledge initiatives led to an increasing amount of research that focus on the management and legislative side of multi-stakeholder partnerships and PPPs. How effectively can partners work together and what kind of model have been used? However, the real impact of PPPs as an instrument that could effectively eradicate or solve problems, such as food insecurity and malnutrition, is less a topic of research. More research is needed into the real impact of PPPs and for what purposes they are more suitable for and for what purposes less so. There is a lot of speculation and potential but parties are looking outside management frameworks and into the impact through improved monitoring and evaluation. As mentioned earlier, the conclusion of the IOB study on PPPs mentions that there is a lack of evidence on the effectiveness and efficiency of PPP arrangements.[59]

There are several research approaches based on the impact side of PPPs and multi-stakeholder partnerships. These include the Seas of Change initiative on Inclusive Business, from WUR-CDI and Sustainable Food Laboratory, which argues that there is enough anecdotal evidence that suggests private-public collaboration in agriculture can reduce poverty and have a multiplier effect for all the stakeholders involved.[60] This programme analyzes the effectiveness of PPPs for poverty reduction and food security. It analyzes the impact of PPPs to their development goals and to the communities that they are designed to help. Initiatives such as this could be interesting for all actors involved in the funding and implementing of public-private relationships for the establishment of more inclusive agri-market development.

Conclusion

Multi-stakeholder partnerships in food security and the related investments in the agricultural sector and rural development increased significantly after 2008. Centred around a handful of global macro-level partnerships, initiated by large corporations, OECD countries and their platforms, and in cooperation with governments of developing countries and their regional platforms, many partnership initiatives for agriculture and food security have seen the light in several African countries. To guarantee local commitments and inclusiveness, civil society organizations and farmers' organizations are involved in dialogue and consultations.

Although many billions of dollars are and will be invested by public and private actors in Africa's agricultural development through these PPP frameworks, there is an increasing discussion about the effectiveness and the inclusiveness of such partnership models. The challenge of increasing the role and potential of smaller businesses and smallholders within agricultural value chains is at the heart of this debate. Better monitoring and impact assessment of current PPPs and multi-stakeholder partnerships are necessary to generate sufficient evidence and build a proper analysis.

The aim of this paper was to provide a brief and non-exhaustive overview of the players who are involved in the PPPs, from companies, civil society, inter-governmental organizations, farmer organizations, to knowledge institutes. The Food & Business Knowledge Platform has produced this as background material for professionals interested in further knowledge sharing and learning about the role of PPPs in food security.

Based on this overview, the Platform has developed some initial questions to be addressed in further research, exchange and learning. Several stakeholders mentioned in this paper, in particular the PPPLab, will facilitate such further work and the Food & Business Knowledge Platform will be a collaborative partner for some of these follow up actions. The questions are:

- How to measure and evaluate the food and nutrition security impact of PPPs or multi-stakeholder partnerships? Who should play a role in this monitoring and evaluation?
- What is the exact role and impact of knowledge institutes and civil society actors within PPP initiatives and, as their role is considered positive, how can their role be strengthened?
- How can multinational corporations and smaller private sector actors work more effectively together within PPPs?
- What are the lessons learnt of 'bottom-up' partnership initiatives, which some stakeholders consider as more effective and inclusive?
- How could knowledge sharing and discussions about inclusive business models be properly linked with those about effective and efficient multi-stakeholder partnerships?

Endnotes

[1] As for example the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development mentions on its website. Or read the presentation of Alain de Janvry and Elisabeth Sadoulet, both University of California at Berkeley, made at the Manlio Rossi-Doria Association meeting in Rome, May 25, 2008.
[2] According to Donortracker.org. See also more on Dutch aid to agriculture and food security at: IOB (2011). Improving Food Security: A systematic review of the impact of interventions in agricultural production, value chains, market regulation, and land security.
[3] World Bank (2008). World Development Report 2008. Agriculture for Development.
[4] Donortracker.org
[5] Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2011). Focusbrief ontwikkelingssamenwerking [Dutch]
[6] The report 'Less Pretension, More Ambition' published by the Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR) in 2010, set this trend towards a more focused policy, pooling the knowledge and expertise of companies and knowledge institutions. The report revived an emphasis on economic growth and resilience as one of the goals of development, asserting that without growth there is nothing to distribute in developing countries. The coalition government at that time transformed this into policy on economic diplomacy, arguing that it would create opportunities for both global and Dutch economic development.
[7] The Netherlands has an extensive agribusiness sector, professionalized and industrialized, which, according to the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 2011, can contribute to the development of global food production and global markets, while at the same time strengthening the sector in the Netherlands.
[8] Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2011), Kamerbrief Uitwerking voedselzekerheidsbeleid [Dutch]
[9] Dutch Policy Letter on food security November 2014.
[10] The new policy letter on food security (2014) explains that Dutch policy focuses now on three main targets: *1. Eradicating hunger and malnutrition:* The focus is on vulnerable people who experience hunger first hand through being affected by poverty, natural disasters, conflicts and other crises. Besides the provision of food aid where needed, permanent access to adequate and proper nutrition is necessary. 2. *Promoting inclusive and sustainable growth in the agricultural sector:* The focus is on small and medium-scale farmers as well as other rural entrepreneurs who could potentially serve market demand. Increasing these people's earning power is a powerful tool in fighting hunger and poverty and promoting economic growth. *3. Achieving ecologically sustainable food systems:* The focus here is on the sustainable management of international public (environmental) goods like water, soil, energy and biodiversity. The effects of climate change on food systems and vice-versa will be considered during all activities.
[11] See for more information for example a short introduction on the basic characteristics of partnerships on the website of F&BKP and the PPPLabs' Insights Series no. 1 (2014): Public-Private Partnerships, a brief introduction
[12] See the website of the Dutch government on development cooperation (accessed April 2015).
[13] Source: website Ministry of Foreign Affairs (accessed April 2015).
[14] See the website of the Netherlands Enterprise Agency (RVO) – accessed April 2015.
[15] IOB (2013) Public Private Partnerships in developing countries
[16] The PPPLab is a four-year research and joint learning & support initiative (2014-2018) in which The Partnerships Resource Centre (PrC), Aqua for All, Centre for Development Innovation at Wageningen UR (CDI), and SNV Netherlands Development Organization work together.
[17] OECD (2012), 'Public Governance of Public-Private Partnerships', Paris: OECD.
[18] See more on the website of the World Economic Forum (accessed April 2015)
[19] Key partners in the New Vision for Agriculture are: A.P. Møller-Maersk, Anheuser-Busch InBev, BASF, Bayer, Brambles, Bunge, Carlsberg Group, CF Industries Holdings, Coca-Cola Company, Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), Diageo, DuPont, GAIN (Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition), International Finance Corporation (IFC), International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Landesa, Mondelez Global, Monsanto Company, Nestlé, Novozymes, Oxfam International, PepsiCo, Royal DSM, Sinar Mas Agribusiness & Food, Swiss Re, Syngenta International, TechnoServe, Unilever, United Phosphorus, Wal-Mart, World Bank, WWF International.
[20] The Strategic Partners involved in NEPAD implementation include: the African Development Bank (AfDB) Group, the African Union (AU), AfricaFertilizer.org, Africa Renewal Online, Africa Platform for Development Effectiveness (APDEv), Council on Health Research for Development (COHRED), Department of International Development (DFID), Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA), Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN), Institute for Security Studies, NEPAD Business Foundation, The Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA), UNDP, UN ECA, United Nations Office of the Special Adviser on Africa (OSAA), UN-Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), UN-World Food Programme.
[21] GROW Africa Partnership Initiative is based on a framework for creating joint commitments among governments, donors and companies and was founded in June 2011 by the African Union, New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and the World Economic Forum. To date, GROW Africa has mobilized over US $10 billion in businesses' investment commitments in ten countries: Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda and Tanzania. See more on the website (accessed April 2015).
[22] Initiated in 2014 by the World Economic Forum in collaboration with the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) Secretariat, GROW Asia serves as a multi-stakeholder partnership platform. GROW Asia supports four country-led partnerships – in Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines and Vietnam – which together have catalysed 26 commodity value chain initiatives. See more on the website (accessed April 2015).
[23] Formed in 2011, VIDA engages over 40 companies and stakeholders in collaboration with the Mexican Ministry of Agriculture, to complement Mexico's national agriculture sector priorities. It focuses on four commodity groups (grains, oilseeds, fruits & vegetables, cocoa & coffee), plus a data and information working group. Local Companies included in the partnership are: AgroBio México, Almidones Mexicanos, Bachoco, Comercializadora Alpro, Comercializadora GAB, Gruma, Grupo Altex, Grupo Bimbo, Grupo Cetto, Grupo Lala, Grupo Minsa, Norson Alimentos, RAGASA Industrias, RYC Alimentos, Tyson de México. Global Companies included in this partnership are: ADM, BASF, Bayer, Bunge, Cargill, Coca-Cola, DuPont, Maersk Line, McKinsey & Co., Monsanto, Nestlé, PepsiCo, Swiss RE, Syngenta, The Mosaic Co., Unilever, Wal-Mart, Yara International. Other Stakeholders in VIDA are: AMECAFE, ANIAME, AMCHAM, AMSDA, AMSAC, CANAINPESCA, CANAMI, CNA, CANAINCA, Confederación Nacional de Pesca, IMCO, PROAGRO, Diversos Comités Sistema Producto, US Embassy in Mexico.
[24] Initiated in the state of Maharashtra in 2011, this partnership aims to develop integrated value chains for specific crops. The partnership now covers 30 value chain projects and has set up an India Business Council to provide business championship and strategic guidance to expand partnership efforts in the country. Maharashtra PPP-IAD CEO Steering Committee includes the Government of Maharashtra (Co-Chair), UPL Limited (Co-Chair), ADM India, Jain Irrigation, Rabobank India, Rallis India, Technoserve, Bombay Chamber of Commerce and Industry (BCCI). Other Partners and Stakeholders are the Confederation of

Indian Industries (CII), Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI), Small Farmers' Agribusiness Consortium (SFAC). Companies Engaged in the 2014-15 Value Chain Projects: Acceso Enterprises/Technoserve (Cashew nut project – leader), ADM (Soybean project – leader), Bayer (Vegetables project – co-leader), B.G. Ghatage Milk Processing (Banana project – leader), COTAAP Research Foundation (Cotton project – co-leader), Daulat Agro (Vegetables project-leader), Deepak Fertilizers (Pomegranate and Grapes 2 projects – leader), Desai Fruits and Vegetables (Banana project – leader), DuPont/Pioneer (Maize project – co-leader), Gomtesh Agro (Rice project – leader), Hindustan Unilever (Tomato project – leader), Jain Irrigation (White Onion and Cotton 2 projects – leader), Kaveri Seeds (Maize project – co-leader and Cotton project – leader), KayBee Exports (Vegetables project – leader), KVK Baramati (Grapes project – leader), MAHYCO Seeds (Cotton and Rice 2 projects – co-leader), Metahelix Life Sciences (Maize project – co-leader), Metro Cash & Carry (Vegetables project – co-leader), Monsanto (Maize project – co-leader), MRDBS (Grapes project – leader), Multiplex Biotech (Maize project – co-leader), Natural Sugar Industries (Potato and Onion project – leader), Nuziveedu Seeds (Cotton project – leader), Olam Agro India (Sugarcane project – leader), Rabobank (Partnership convening support), Rallis India (Pulses, Grapes, Pomegranate, Orange 4 projects – leader), Sanjeevani Agro Co-Op Society (Banana project – leader), Saguna Baug (Paddy project – co-leader), Siddhivinayak Agri Processing (Potato seed production project – leader), Swiss-Re (Crop insurance project – leader), TAFE (Maize project – co-leader), UPL Limited (Maize project – co-leader), VST Tiller Tractors (Rice project – leader), Western Agro Seeds (Paddy project – co-leader).

[25] For example, the State of Maharashtra is co-financing 30 value chain projects representing more than $50 million in total value on improving value chains for 15 crops: maize, soybean, pulses, cotton, onion, rice, tomato, potato, vegetables, banana, pomegranate, grape, orange, cashew nut, and sugarcane. This cost is shared between public sector government schemes, companies and farmers' contributions.

[26] See website of the World Economic Forum on the New Vision on Agriculture (accessed April 2015).

[27] See website of the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition (accessed April 2015).

[28] Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal and Tanzania

[29] The CAADP was initiated by the African Union and NEPAD in 2003. It presents a comprehensive framework to transform African agriculture. The New Alliance directly contributes to and catalyses the implementation of CAADP's overarching goals to end hunger and halve poverty in Africa by 2025. It also supports the implementation of National Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plans in countries performing well in CAADP and that have shown a commitment to address difficult policy constraints. New Alliance commitments are reviewed as part of the CAADP Agriculture Joint Sector Review process. See for more information on the website (accessed April 2015).

[30] The Leadership council's members in 2014. Co-conveners in 2014 are: African Union Commission, United States Government, World Economic Forum. *African governments and agencies* are: Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Republic of Côte d'Ivoire, Republic of Mozambique, United Republic of Tanzania, New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) Secretariat. *Multilateral organizations* are: International Finance Corporation (IFC), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). *Civil Society and farmers' organization*s are: Eastern Africa Farmers Federation, Oxfam America, Pan African Farmers Organization & ROPPA (Network of Farmers' and Agricultural Producers' Organizations of West Africa), Southern African Confederation of Agricultural Unions (SACAU). *Private sector partners* are: Equity Bank, Omega Farms, Premium Foods, Syngenta, Unilever, Yara. *Development partners* are: Canada, European Union, Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Republic of France, Republic of Italy, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

[31] Oxfam (2014), Moral Hazard: Mega Public Private Partnerships in African Agriculture, 188 Oxfam Briefing Papers, September.

[32] Another interesting paper on multi-stakeholder initiatives which clearly describes the multiple scales involved is *Global Multi-stakeholder Partnerships: Scaling up public-private collective impact of the SDGs*, Background Paper 4 of the Independent Research Forum, written by Peter Hazlewood of the World Resources Institute (February 2015) http://www.irf2015.org/sites/default/files/publications/Retreat%20%236_BP%204_Final%20for%20website.pdf

[33] See for more information for example a short introduction on the basic characteristics of partnerships on the website of F&BKP and the PPPLabs' Insights Series no. 1 (2014): Public-Private Partnerships, a brief introduction

[34] Pattberg, Philipp and Oscar Widerberg (2014): Transnational Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships for Sustainable Development. Building Blocks for Success. *IVM Report, R-14/31*. Amsterdam: Institute for Environmental Studies. The International Civil Society Centre has shortened and slightly revised the original full text without interfering with its major findings.

[35] Patient capital is another name for long term capital. With patient capital, the investor is willing to make a financial investment in a business with no expectation of turning a quick profit. Instead, the investor is willing to forgo an immediate return in anticipation of more substantial returns down the road. Although patient capital can be considered a traditional investment instrument, it has gained new life with the rise in environmentally and socially responsible enterprises. In this case, it may take the form of equity, debt, loan guarantees or other financial instruments. (Wikipedia)

[36] Oxfam (2014), Moral Hazard: Mega Public Private Partnerships in African Agriculture, 188 Oxfam Briefing Papers, September.

[37] The members include: Agco Corporation, Archer Daniels Midland, BASF, Bayer AG, Bunge Limited, Cargill, CF Industries, The Coca-Cola Company, Diageo, DuPont, General Mills, Heineken NV, Kraft Foods, Louis Dreyfus Commodities, Maersk, Metro AG, Monsanto Company, Nestlé, PepsiCo, Rabobank, Royal DSM, SABMiller, Swiss Reinsurance Company Ltd, Syngenta, The Mosaic Company Unilever and Yara International.

[38] See the website of Oxfam (accessed April 2015)

[39] Economist Intelligent Unit (2013), Transforming African agriculture: The growing importance of unusual public-private partnerships, The Economist (Sponsored by Yara).

[40] Idem.

[41] See overview of international PPP units on the website of the World Bank (accessed April 2015).

[42] See news article on the website of the African Development Bank of 27-05-2014.

[43] From the AfDB's webpage on Public Private Partnerships (accessed April 2015).

[44] See for example the website of Farming First about the Ghana Grain Partnership. See on the website of Prorustica information on the Tanzanian Agricultural Partnership and the Malawi Agricultural Partnership.

[45] UCAMA, UGC, UNAC, UPTete – according to the website of the Beira Corridor (accessed April 2015)

[46] See here there statement.

[47] World Vision International (2014), Reaching the Unreached: Cross-sector partnerships, business and the post-2015 development, The Post 2015 Agenda: Policy Paper, October.

[48] Helena Paul and Ricarda Steinbrecher (2013), African Growth Corridors and the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition: Who benefits, who loses?, report of EcoNexus, June.

[49] Pattberg, Philipp and Oscar Widerberg (2014): Transnational Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships for Sustainable Development. Building Blocks for Success. *IVM Report, R-14/31*. Amsterdam: Institute for Environmental Studies. The International Civil Society Centre has shortened and slightly revised the original full text without interfering with its major findings.

[50] Fair Trade Foundation (2014), A seat at the table? Ensuring smallholder farmers are heard in public-private partnerships, Report September.

[51] Oxfam (2014), Moral Hazard: Mega Public Private Partnerships in African Agriculture, 188 Oxfam Briefing Papers, September.
[52] See here the official website (accessed April 2015).
[53] See here more information (accessed April 2015).
[54] See the website of the German Food Partnership (accessed April 2015).
[55] See document (PDF) on the website of the Netherlands Enterprise Agency (RVO).
[56] See for example the F&BKP report of the network and knowledge meeting with social entrepreneurs and impact investors that took place on 27 February 2015 in Utrecht, the Netherlands.
[57] See the conference report of IDRC 'Implementing Public-Private Partnerships in Agriculture' – March 2012, Ottawa, Canada.
[58] See the presentation of Wilhelm Elfring, Consultant to "EU-Working Group on Private Sector Development in Agriculture" (PSDA), during CTA's Brussels Policy Briefing no.39 on the role of agribusiness and development partnerships in advancing African Agriculture in 2014.
[59] IOB (2013) Public Private Partnerships in developing countries – the report's conclusions are based on 47 studies that provide empirical evidence on PPP effectiveness, including 18 case studies and 29 reviews.
[60] See the website of Seas of Change (accessed April 2015).