Federal Ministry
for Economic Cooperation
and Development

DISCOURSE 015

Development Policy Stance on the Topic of Land Grabbing – the Purchase and Leasing of Large Areas of Land in Developing Countries

Contents

1. The Battle for Land, a Resource that is Becoming More and More Scarce Worldwide

In order to keep pace with the growth of the world's population, global food production will have to be increased by 70 per cent by 2050 (OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2009–2018). In addition, the number of people suffering from hunger is currently on the increase: in 2009, according to data from the World Food Organization, the figure will pass the billion mark for the first time. This calls for increased investment in agriculture, particularly in the developing countries.

The production factor land is under greater pressure than ever from competing users. Continuing population growth, urbanisation – leading to increased soil sealing – climate change, desertification and widespread erosion are all raising the pressure on land and other connected natural resources. In addition, the competition for scarce agricultural land is continuously rising in the wake of increasing demand for food and fodder and for biomass as a source of raw materials and to generate energy. This increased demand is primarily a result of the continuing growth and development taking place in industrialised countries and emerging economies.

As a result of all these factors, combined with global increases in the price of food, a process described in international news headlines as "land grabbing" has accelerated. This process involves **governments and private investors from industrialised countries and emerging economies securing large tracts of agricultural land in developing countries by means of long-term lease or purchase agreements**. The land is then used to grow food or energy-producing plants either for general export or specifically to meet the food and energy needs of the investing countries. Some 22 million hectares of agricultural land has already been sold or leased or is the subject of negotiations – that is an area almost as big as Great Britain, and often represents a major share of all the agricultural land available in the country "relinquishing" the land. In the current financial crisis and in the expectation that agricultural prices and ground rents will continue to rise, land is increasingly being seen as a speculative investment. Agricultural funds, which invest in agricultural land and are also seeing their investments appreciate as the value of the land goes up due to it being in ever shorter supply, are currently a highly sought-after product on the financial markets. The dimensions of this trend, the huge lack of transparency generally associated with such land deals, and the unequal weight of the two sides engaged in the contract negotiations are a cause for concern that new dependent relationships are evolving, with the majority of the poor people in rural areas in developing countries being pushed even further into the margins of global society.

Food security – a key topic at the 2009 G8 summit

The participants in the G8 summit (G8 countries, G5 and African countries and international organisations) signed the *L'Aquila Food Security Initiative*. It foresees that **20 billion US dollars** will be made available over the next three years **for longer term investments in agriculture and in rural development in developing countries.** In addition, the G8 countries reached an agreement on the development of a joint proposal for principles and best practices for this type of investment.

The poorest developing countries, which are generally also those with the biggest governance deficits, are the worst hit

According to the information available, the following developing countries in Africa and Asia are particularly affected by this problem: Angola, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Cambodia, Kenya, the Democratic Republic of Congo, the People's Republic of Congo, Laos, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Zambia, (southern) Sudan, Tanzania and the Philippines. However, comparable developments can also be observed in Brazil, the Russian Federation and in Ukraine. Most developing countries where large tracts of agricultural land are being sold or leased are big countries in terms of land area, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. They are for the most part the poorest developing countries with the lowest income, countries that are still struggling to overcome serious food deficits and rural poverty. Agricultural production levels in these countries are very low. Generally speaking they are countries where democracy has not yet taken a firm hold, with relatively weak governance structures and a low level of legal certainty.

In the past, **investors** in large-scale agriculture were almost exclusively from industrialised countries; today they mainly come from three groups of countries:

- East Asian countries where population pressure is high and economic growth is strong (China, South Korea and Japan), which are experiencing rapidly growing demand for food, fodder and agricultural raw materials for industry or energy generation (for example rubber and cotton);
- food importing countries from the Arab region with limited land and water resources, but plenty of capital available thanks to oil riches (Bahrain, Libya, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia), which are trying to reduce their dependence on world market price trends by investing directly in land and food production abroad;
- industrialised countries looking for land on which to grow agricultural raw materials; oil conglomerates in particular – some of them from European countries – are trying to secure land for the future cultivation of oil-producing plants and maize and sugar cane for energy production in the post-oil era.

An important criterion, which is also important in terms of the need for action deriving from it, is the distinction between **state, parastatal and private players**:

- Contracts for investments in land are increasingly being negotiated directly between governments (represented, for example, by their agricultural ministries or state agricultural development associations). Other state or parastatal players are government funds and companies where the state is the sole or the majority shareholder. In addition, some governments are fostering investment by private companies by means of targeted support, favourable general conditions and indirect participation by state funds in private sector direct investments.
- The majority of these large-scale land deals are still being made by the private sector. Private sector activities are, however, no longer limited to agricultural companies or conglomerates with a mixture of interests; we are increasingly seeing investment funds engaging in such activities.
- In many cases, local elites or companies in the developing countries themselves have interests in land investments, either as negotiators representing foreign investors or as partners in joint ventures.

Information situation: many reports but a great lack of transparency

A high degree of media attention and the sensitivity of this topic have produced a flood of information from various sources just recently, but not all of it is reliable or verifiable. Generally the reports rely extensively on information garnered from the international media and from the local press in the countries concerned. Reports about new land deals often fail to make it clear whether they are about contracts that have already been signed or about vague declarations of intent and prospective announcements by investors. As a result, there is a huge lack of transparency surrounding the whole issue. Only a very few cases are known in which information about the nature and content of the contracts and about the stage reached in the negotiations is available to the public.

In Available figures are only the "tip of the iceberg"

Since 2008, various international non-governmental organisations (first and foremost GRAIN) have increased their efforts to direct the attention of the public and politicians towards the unfolding drama of land grabbing. Internet pages and blogs set up for this specific purpose mainly consist of reviews of press reports. International research and development organisations (including the World Bank, IFPRI and FAO) are in the process of carrying out studies with the aim of getting a comprehensive overview of the dimensions of large-scale land acquisitions and collecting evidence of prevailing governance deficits using empirical country case studies. The initial findings from these studies show that, because of the great lack of transparency, the real dimensions and the rapid increase in this trend have far outpaced the records relating to land deals in the countries concerned and current reporting at the national and international level. There is, therefore, a very real danger that the reports in the public domain have so far only touched upon the "tip of the iceberg" with regard to this problem. Although the acquisition of land in developing countries by foreign investors is not really a new phenomenon, in recent years the growth in such transactions and the amount of land involved have given it an entirely new dimension, making it an increasingly risky development.

2. Driving Forces – Causes and Impact Chains

The intentions and goals associated with direct investments in land in developing countries are very diverse. Economic and geo-strategic interests are often closely intertwined. Even if the investors usually do not reveal the intentions and goals behind their large-scale acquisitions of land, according to the information currently available, it can be assumed that the following three strategies are determining factors:

- **Food security in investing countries** – outsourcing of food production is a strategy pursued by countries that do not have sufficient agricultural land of their own and are therefore already dependent to a large extent on food imports and will continue to be in the future. The export ban posed by some net exporters of food in reaction to the food crisis in 2007 and 2008 encouraged these importing countries to increase their efforts to reduce dependency on the world market for agricultural products. The current situation, with food prices rising or fluctuating sharply, makes it more difficult for these countries to plan ahead, creating stronger incentives for them to make more use of fertile land in other countries to grow food crops themselves to feed their populations back home.

- **Production of agricultural raw materials for energy generation or other industrial uses** – buying or leasing land for the large-scale cultivation of raw materials for use as biomass is an activity generally carried out by investors from industrialised countries. The lack of available land and declining advances in productivity in their home countries, but also the cheaper production costs and more favourable conditions in developing countries in Africa and other regions are the deciding factors when it comes to this type of direct investment in land. Blending quotas for agrofuels in many countries and the upward trend of oil prices are an additional spur to companies and governments to engage in or promote such investments. We are also increasingly seeing oil conglomerates getting involved in such investments in a bid to secure land for the cultivation of energy-producing plants in the post-oil era.

- **Securing water rights for investors** – acquiring land without the water resources necessary for cultivating it would be a pointless agricultural investment. Indeed, the majority of land bought or leased by foreign investors is in locations with the potential for irrigation. By purchasing the land or signing a long-term lease, the investors also acquire the rights to extract and use the water on the land. The growing shortage of global water resources and the water shortages that many countries are already facing or are likely to face as a result are reason enough to assume that many of the land grabs we are seeing are also “water grabs”.

Globalisation – land is increasingly becoming a good that is also traded internationally

The growth in land purchases, concessions and lease agreements is in essence the consequence of long-term structural changes and the globalisation of economic relations: in many developing countries, it is market-economy reforms and the privatisation of land following the “shift” in politics after 1989 that have made it possible for sales and leasing markets to emerge. The result has been and continues to be that land and water rights are increasingly transformed into tradable goods. It is hard to say at present which is exerting the greatest pressure on available land resources, the desire for food security or the efforts to secure long-term coverage of energy and water needs for a still-growing world population. One thing is clear: all the factors are pushing up land prices and leasing rates, increasing the income to be made from land and thus encouraging marginal and borderline land to be cultivated again or for the first time, or accelerating the rate at which forests and savannah land are being cleared for agricultural use. It is also clear that, with foreign acquisitions of land increasingly being made for the strategic purpose of supplying the population in the investor country with agricultural products, we find less and less emphasis on the potential economic welfare effects which can result from a fair and open global agricultural market.

New investment and speculation possibilities

The way financial markets have developed in the recent past is another factor that has led to an increase in the number, size and frequency of land deals. Even if there are as yet scarcely any reliable findings relating to the impact of the financial crisis on long-term developments, the expectation that the returns on investments in land will continue to grow in countries with adequate legal certainty should be enough to favour further direct investments. Private sector investment funds that invest in agricultural land and profit from its increased value as a result of the growing shortage of land are currently a highly sought-after product on the financial markets. Land deals are becoming increasingly speculative in anticipation of further price increases.

3. Risks and Opportunities for Developing Countries

The social, economic, political and ecological impacts on the local population and the region as a result of investors making large-scale purchases of land or signing long-term leases, depend very much on the regulatory framework within which they must operate and on how the contracts are framed. Foreign direct investments in land are a special case because of specific characteristics. They entail far-reaching risks, but also offer opportunities, although only if certain general conditions pertain and the necessary norms and laws are drafted, passed and enforced. This is because investments in poor regions can improve the living situation of the population concerned, but can also have very negative impacts when handled in an irresponsible manner.

From the development policy perspective, particular attention needs to be paid to the following risks:

- Exacerbation of **land conflicts, increased rural exodus, resettlement or displacement of the local population** – if land tenure and land use rights in the areas where land is being acquired are inadequately documented or lack a formal legal basis, then it is scarcely possible to protect people against this kind of land grab. The highly unequal power relationships that generally pertain in land deals (smallholder versus major investor, for example) mean that the local population has scarcely any chance of enforcing their existing land rights. Particularly in countries characterised by a lack of legal certainty, unsecured land rights and corruption, foreign acquisition can pose a **threat to a country's stability and peace**.

- **Food security of the local population is endangered** – poverty and hunger are prevalent in most of the countries experiencing foreign direct investment in agricultural land. When no food is grown on the land that has been bought or leased, or the food grown is mainly for export to the investing countries, the precarious food situation for the local population will be further exacerbated, if production for local needs is squeezed out by the foreign investment and nothing is done to compensate for the lost production by buying in food from other markets.

- Large-scale farming by investors can **further marginalise smallholder farming** and destroy small farmers' livelihoods. In addition to land rights covering the cultivation of staples, **traditional grazing rights, water rights** and **the right to gather** what is growing wild (for example firewood or medicinal plants) are also **threatened**; for women in particular these rights are vital to their livelihoods and to the livelihoods of their families and the entire society.

- The typical farming methods used on the **large-scale agro-industrial plantations** that frequently result from such land deals, ranging from extensive areas of monoculture with intensive use of pesticides and mineral fertilisers all the way to growing genetically modified seeds, are a potential source of **negative environmental and social impacts**.

- Foreign direct investments in land are above all problematic when they affect local population groups for whom **no new, additional income opportunities** are created because investors bring in workers from their own countries or make extensive use of mechanised production methods. For the local population this not only means the loss of traditional farming activities as a basis for securing their survival and as a source of paid employment, but also that the investment does not offer them any alternative income opportunities.

In many countries we are already seeing how the strong economic incentives for agricultural production are **further increasing the threat to natural habitats that need to be protected** (for example, increases in the slash and burn clearance of rain forests and in the encroachment of farmed crops on traditional grazing land). Even in countries that already have effective mechanisms in place to protect such resources, we find that the continuing surges in the price offered for agricultural land, growing competition for land, and political influence being exerted on the authorities responsible for nature reserves are pushing up the pressure on land resources. The spread of intensive agricultural production, particularly monocultures, at the expense of forests or sustainable grazing leads to a loss of biodiversity, increased problems due to soil erosion, over-use of water resources, the loss of CO2 reservoirs and increased emissions of greenhouse gases, also leading ultimately to accelerated climate change. These risks occur in particular when investors' main interest is in making a quick profit from export-oriented agricultural production and surges in the price of land and agricultural products. Such short-term strategies can have very negative longer term impacts on the economic activities and living conditions of the local population.

Real opportunities when strict conditions are observed

Many developing countries see the advantages that foreign direct investment can bring them, particularly the introduction of new capital and new technologies. Higher government revenues from investments in land and agricultural projects can – when re-invested – form the basis for increased production and income and thus also improve the living conditions of the rural population. **The following opportunities and potentials in relation to development policy and the national economy can arise from these investments**:

- **A greater flow of capital into the agricultural sector** is urgently needed so as to overcome chronic under-financing of the agricultural sector. There should be support for increased investment in the agricultural sector per se, but not for the acquisition or leasing of land on a large scale with all the risks described above; instead pro-poor, socially and ecologically sustainable measures should be pursued: these include appropriate technology, institutions, infrastructure and jobs. Only pro-poor investments have the potential to bring about the desired positive impacts on the people living in the rural areas. These investments must therefore be guided by the needs and priorities of the local population and be gender sensitive.

- **Additional employment and income opportunities** for the population can be created if foreign direct investment in agriculture is tied into poverty reduction strategies and thus develops positive welfare impacts that go beyond the agricultural sector. Since poverty affects women in rural regions the most, they should be given particular consideration.

- If foreign investments are coupled with fair procedures, for example, contract farming, then this can give participating smallholders (both women and men) **access to innovations, agricultural services, inputs and markets**, thus increasing the productivity of their labour and securing sales of their products at acceptable prices; the result is higher income for them. In addition, other support measures such as extension services and training, the expansion of social and economic infrastructure in rural areas (for example health centres or roads) are integral components of such fair, development-oriented contracts and also have positive impacts on economic and social systems in rural areas.

- By **effectively involving the local population** in the planning, contract negotiations and implementation of the investments, it is possible to make sure that their requirements in terms of income and food security are taken into proper account. Since women are often in dependent relationships in terms of access to land and therefore do not have the same negotiating power as men, it is particularly important that special attention is given to their role and interests as farmers, producers of food and important economic actors. Contract agreements must be designed in such a way that they respect existing, including non-formal, land rights, lead to win-win situations for the participants, and integrate the principles of social and ecological sustainability.

- In order to motivate foreign investors to make sustainable, development-oriented investments in agriculture, they must have **secure rights of use over the developed resources** for their own **planning security**. However, this does not necessarily mean contracts for the sale of land and long-term leases. Other forms of contract should be used here, for example, concessions and contract farming whilst simultaneously taking into account the existing rights to use resources enjoyed by the local population and benefit sharing.

Six basic principles

In order to be able to make use of the possible opportunities and potential, it is important when framing and implementing investments in land to **adhere to the following six basic principles**:

1. **Participation and transparency in the negotiations:** Contract negotiations are to be transparent and involve all relevant stakeholders, particularly the rural population.

2. **Recognition of existing rights:** The existing land use rights, including non-formal and traditional rights, of the local population are to be respected and taken into account in the contract agreements. Particular efforts are needed in order to protect the rights of indigenous groups.

3. **Compensation:** Anyone who loses land shall receive compensation on the basis of the livelihood value of the land lost.

4. **Fair sharing in the benefits of the investment:** Investments in land should be tied into the poverty reduction strategies of the target countries. This calls for contract agreements to be designed in such a way that they foster pro-poor growth, promote transparency and the use of state revenues for the national wellbeing and domestic development goals, and ensure that the local population can share in the profits from the investments.

5. **Sustainability:** Ecological sustainability must also be ensured in addition to economic and social sustainability. Investments in land should not be made at the expense of natural resources (soil, water, forests, biodiversity, climate).

6. **The human right to food:** Food security for the population concerned in the target countries and thus the enforcement of the human right to food must take precedence over all other forms of land use (such as growing energy-producing plants for agrofuels).

There needs to be a realistic assessment of the opportunities and risks. – If foreign direct investment is agreed upon and implemented on the basis of these principles, then it can play an important role in the economic development of rural areas. To arrive at a realistic assessment of the risks and opportunities involved in direct investments in land, an objective appraisal should be carried out before the negotiations begin, in order to evaluate the potential socio-economic and ecological impacts of the proposal. In addition, there must be close monitoring to ensure that the above principles are observed during the implementation of the investment and evaluate the impact in terms of sustainability and poverty reduction. The findings of studies and evaluations must be available not only to political decision-makers and investors but also to the people directly affected and to the broad public.

4. Need for Action

In order to both stem the dangers and risks of the negative form of land grabbing, which is irresponsible and speculative, and also make optimum use of the possible opportunities and potential of **development-oriented direct investment in land and rural development**, there must be **forward-looking political guidance**. There is a need for political action at the following levels:

a) International policy dialogue

The first step must be to discuss the problems in talks and negotiations with participating and affected governments. This is above all a question of advising them about appropriate action in order to counter the risks and take advantage of possible opportunities for increasing agricultural productivity and improving food security in line with pro-poor growth. Already existing dialogue structures and partnerships, for example, within the framework of the G8 Partnership with Africa, the Heiligendamm-L'Aquila Process, the OECD/DAC and the EU-Africa Partnership should be used for this dialogue. They also offer a foundation and framework for international consultation regarding agreements about responsible conduct and development-oriented transnational investments. At the 2009 summit in L'Aquila, the G8 countries agreed in a first step to develop – non-binding – principles and best practices for international investments in agriculture. The next step is to involve as many partners as possible from all country groups in a process that leads to binding guidelines for sustainable and responsible investments in land and in agriculture.

b) Participation and civil society control

There needs to be greater awareness and publicity about the possible negative and positive impacts of investments in land for the women and men affected by such investments. Civil society has an important function in terms of disseminating information and monitoring contract negotiations and their final outcomes. Civil society representatives should be actively involved in the contract negotiations. Where necessary, civil society organisations must also be supported and promoted so that they can carry out these monitoring functions. This means in particular strengthening them at the local level, since the necessary monitoring can only be carried out on the ground.

c) Establishing a solid information base and transparency in the contract negotiations

There is urgent need to establish a solid, broad basis of information covering the general conditions, the goals and the intentions of national contract parties and foreign investors, the areas concerned and the types of use, contract negotiations and agreements, and the use of the resultant revenues. Likewise, in the case of major investments in land, there must also be contractual provisions for monitoring adherence to the principles agreed to in the contracts and making regular checks on the – positive and negative – impact of investments, and for making the results available to the public. That way it would be possible to intervene at an early stage if there are any negative developments. Comprehensive information and transparency regarding investments that are planned or have already been made are needed to provide a basis for judging what further action may be required and for planning support measures in line with sustainable development.

Establishing transparency – a comprehensive survey of land concessions in Laos

A survey commissioned by the National Land Management and Administration Authority (NLMA) and carried out in April 2009 of land concessions granted in the province of Vientiane since 1999 produced alarming results. For example, from a total of about 240 registered concessions, only 12 included maps and coordinates showing the location and extent of the land area concerned. In a majority of cases the land already being exploited does not tally with the areas listed in the concession agreement. In some cases the region designated for the investment was leased more than once to a variety of different contract partners. The assessment of the land deals, the number of which has been increasing rapidly since 2004, has caused national and local authorities in Laos to undergo a change of perception with regard to the need to monitor large-scale land grants. Further surveys in other provinces have already been commissioned. Creating transparency with this kind of survey is a vital step towards preventing the negative impacts of land acquisitions by foreign investors.

d) Strengthening and supporting national land policies and pertinent legislation, including institution building

National land policies must take into account the special characteristics of a country, for example, traditional property rights and rights of use, and include them in binding regulations elaborated in a participatory process involving all affected groups of people. The aim of the policy dialogue with the developing countries affected by FDI in land should be sustainable and just national land policies so formulated that they help to reduce poverty and conflict, policies which are firmly anchored in the legislation of the particular developing country and are implemented and enforced by corresponding institutions. Promoting gender equality in land policy, legislation and political and administrative decision-making should be mainstreamed at the national and local levels. Providing advice and support for the elaboration and implementation of national land policies and the development of institutions to shape and enforce these policies should therefore play an important role in development cooperation programmes and be furthered accordingly.

e) Binding international guidelines – Code of Conduct – for sustainable and responsible investments in land

Since the majority of documented land acquisitions are international deals, in addition to national land policies, internationally recognised guidelines are also needed, which are binding in both the investing countries and in the countries where the investments are made, and for other intermediaries such as banks, the UN special organisations, etc. The aim is to draw up a code of conduct based on the above **six principles** that becomes legally binding for all countries and players involved in such transactions. Voluntary commitments and government agreements at the international level, for example, those within the framework of the African Land Policy Initiative, the EU Land Policy Guidelines or the Maputo Declaration on Agriculture and Food Security, are a crucial basis here and an important step in the right direction. In order to improve transparency with regard to contracts and the management of revenues, for example, through public tenders and the involvement of civil society, the experience and principles of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) could be drawn upon.

f) Making more consistent use of existing international law

The development of a code that is recognised as binding by the major players would take some time. It is therefore important to make consistent and active use of existing international legislation that can already be enforced through the courts today if the recommended six basic principles are not observed. It is important here that binding international law is used and further developed. This includes enforcing the human right to food, observing international environmental standards, protecting against forced displacement, adhering to the ILO conventions both with regard to the protection of the land rights of indigenous peoples and also with regard to international labour laws for those who work the land and the ILO core labour standards, as well as commitments arising from investment agreements and international trade agreements.

Regional human rights courts in Africa and Latin America have already handed down decisions and rulings relating to the responsibility of governments to shape and monitor contracts with multinational companies and to recognise traditional rights of land use. Regional courts are therefore an important complementary partner of civil society at the supranational level. They should be strengthened both in policy dialogue (for example at government negotiations and consultations) and in the enforcement of concrete measures.

Ongoing processes for the elaboration of international guidelines and policies

International guidelines are an important frame of reference for planning, agreeing and enforcing measures to improve land management. German development policy has supported the elaboration of pertinent **guidelines on land policy** and promotes their implementation and enforcement. These include in particular the **FAO Voluntary Guidelines for the Right to Food** and the **EU Land Policy Guidelines**.

Particularly relevant is likely to be the FAO proposal for the elaboration of **Voluntary Guidelines for Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land and other Natural Resources**. These voluntary guidelines are meant to support the efforts by governments to design sustainable rights of access to and use of land and other natural resources, to build up corresponding institutional structures and thus also stem corruption in the land sector.

Other guidelines and policies of regional relevance are currently being elaborated with German support (for example, the African Land Policy Initiative – AU/UNECA).

Given the topicality of this issue, German development policy actors working jointly with the European Commission have successfully reactivated the **EU Working Group on Land Issues**. The Group’s main focus is on “foreign direct investments in land”; it keeps a close watch on current developments and draws up proposals for necessary EU measures to reduce possible risks.

Annex

Overview of FDI in land – as at 29 June 2009

Africa

Host country	Investor	Land area (or investment volume)	Land use	Status of the contract
Angola	Lonrho (GB)	25 000 ha leased (Lonrho is negotiating for another 125 000 ha in Mali and Malawi)	rice	signed
Cameroon	Unknown investors (China)	10 000 ha	rice	contract in place
Democratic Republic of the Congo	China (ZTE International)	2.8m ha	agrofuels, palm oil plantation	signed
Egypt	Jenat (Saudi Arabia)	10 000 ha	barley, wheat, animal fodder	unknown
Ethiopia	Unknown investors (Saudi Arabia)	US $100m	unknown	signed
	Flora Eco Power (Germany)	13 000 ha	agro-fuels; agreement for contract farming	signed
	India	US $4bn	farm crops, flowers, sugar cane	unknown
Kenya	Qatar	40 000 ha leased in exchange for construction of a harbour (US $2.3 bn)	fruit and vegetables	signed
Madagascar	Daewoo (South Korea)	1.3m ha	maize	disrupted
	Varun (India)	231 910 ha (170 914 ha farmland and 60 996 ha government land)	food	planned
	Madabeef (Madagascan company, owned and financed by foreign investors (GB))	200 000 ha; US $480m	cattle	unknown
	Bio Energy Limited (Madagascan company with Australian investors)	120 000 ha	jatropha	planned
	Avana Group (GB)	10 000 ha	jatropha	planned
	Delta Petroli (Italy)	50 000 ha; approx. US $70m	jatropha	since 2008
	ER Company (country of registration unknown)	80 000 ha	jatropha	unknown
	Global Agrofuel (Lebanon)	100 000 ha	jatropha	unknown
	GEM Biofuels (GB)	452 500 ha	jatropha	since 2006
	OSHO Group (South Africa)	100 000 ha	sugar cane for ethanol	unknown
	Tozzi Renewable Energy (Italy)	100 000 ha; US $300m	jatropha	unknown

Africa

Host country	Investor	Land area (or investment volume)	Land use	Status of the contract
Mali	Libya	100 000 ha	rice	signed
Mozambique	China	US $800m	rice	disrupted (political resistance)
	Sekab (Sweden)	100 000 ha	agrofuels	unknown
Nigeria	Trans4mation Agric-tech Ltd (GB)	10 000 ha	unknown	signed
People's Republic of the Congo	AgriSA (South Africa)	The farmers union has been offered 8m ha	unknown	delayed
Sudan	Jordan	25 000 ha	animal husbandry and grain	signed
	Saudi Arabia (Hail Agricultural Development Co.)	9 200-10 117 ha leased (60% financed by Saudi Arabian government)	grain, vegetables, animal fodder	signed
	South Korea	690 000 ha	grain	signed
	United Arab Emirates (UAE)	378 000 ha	unknown	being put in place
	UAE (Abu Dhabi Development Fund)	30 000 ha	maize, alfalfa (probably potatoes, grain and beans too)	signed
	Jarch Capital (USA)	400 000 ha	unknown	signed
Tanzania	Saudi Arabia	500 000 ha	unknown	requested
	CAMS Group (GB)	45 000 ha (bought)	sweet sorghum (agro-fuel)	contract in place
	Sun Biofuels (GB)	5 500 ha	jatropha	unknown
Zambia	China	2m ha	jatropha	requested
Zimbabwe	China (Int. Water and Electric Corp.)	101 000 ha	grain	rights of use transferred
Egypt, Ethiopia, Sudan	Tadco (Saudi Arabia)	US $40m	wheat	planned

Asia

Host country	Investor	Land area (or investment volume)	Land use	Status of the contract
Cambodia	Vietnam Rubber Group	100 000 ha	rubber	planned (2009)
	Kuwait	US $546m	rice (lease agreement for 70-90 years)	signed
	Qatar	US $200m	agriculture	planned
	Chinese Farm Cooperation	300 000 ha	development of "surplus" forest land (rights of use for 70 years)	signed (2000)
Indonesia	Saudi Arabia (Bin Laden Group)	500 000 ha; US $4.3bn	rice	disrupted
Laos	Vietnam Rubber Group	100 000 ha	rubber	planned (2009)
Pakistan	Saudi Arabia / other Gulf states	405 000 ha	food	under negotiation
	UAE (Abraaj Capital)	324 000 ha (bought)	unknown	being put in place
Philippines	China	1.24 Mio. ha (leased)	unknown	disrupted
	Qatar	100 000 ha (leased)	unknown	unknown

Other countries

Host country	Investor	Land area (or investment volume)	Land use	Status of the contract
Brazil	Mitsui (Japan)	100 000 ha	soya beans	contract in place
Russian Federation	Alpcot Agro (Sweden)	128 000 ha	unknown	contract in place
	Trigon (Denmark)	100 000 ha	unknown	contract in place
	Black Earth Farming (Sweden)	331 000 ha	unknown	contract in place
Ukraine	Morgan Stanley (USA)	40 000 ha (bought)	unknown	contract in place
	Landkom (GB)	100 000 ha (leased)	unknown	contract in place

Sources: FAO, IIED, NGO GRAIN, Reuters – this list has been compiled on the basis of press reports and studies by the institutes listed here. International press releases furnish new figures relating to land area and financial volume almost daily. Well documented contracts are rare and details mostly unknown. In some cases information is contradictory.

Bibliography

Braun, Joachim and Meinzen-Dick, Ruth (2009):
Land Grabbing by Foreign Investors in Developing Countries: Risks and Opportunities.
The International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI); IFPRI Policy Brief 13.
Policy brief covering the latest developments relating to FDI in land and the associated opportunities and risks. Presentation of possible approaches for bringing about win-win situations. Definition of principles that an international code of conduct should include.

Cotula, Lorenzo, Vermeulen, Sonja et al. (2009):
Land grab or development opportunity? Agricultural investment and international land deals in Africa.
IIED (The International Food Policy Research Institute), FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization), IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development).
Study into the background and conditions of land grabbing with a quantitative analysis of investments in Ethiopia, Mali, Madagascar and Sudan. A presentation of the negative impacts of land grabbing leads to recommendations for contract and business models for FDI in land as a necessary basis for making use of possible development opportunities.

Cotula, Lorenzo; Vermeulen, Sonja; Dyer, Nat (2008):
Fuelling exclusion? The biofuels boom and poor people's access to land.
FAO, IIED.
The side effects and indirect impacts of investments in land on the rights to use resources and on food security in emerging economies and developing countries are considered against the background of rising demand for biofuels.

Deininger, Klaus and Songwe, Vera (2009):
Foreign Investment in Agricultural Production: Opportunities and Challenge.
World Bank, Agriculture & Rural Development Notes, Land Policy and Administration, Issue 45.
Presentation of the background and impacts of large-scale direct investments in land. General considerations relating to checking the negative impacts and risks in relation to land rights, profit sharing and contract assurances. Lists possible approaches for development policy.

GRAIN (2008):
Seized: The 2008 land grab for food and financial security.
Weblink: http://www.grain.org/briefings/?id=212.
The first comprehensive publication on land grabbing, the background to this development, and the participating actors and their interests. Main focus of the presentation: the negative consequences for poor people in developing countries. A list – mainly derived from media reports – of investors (individuals and countries) and host countries with details of land area, which is updated regularly.

Jamart, Clara et al. (2009):
Commercial Pressures on Land Worldwide – Issues and Conceptual Framework.
ILC (International Land Coalition).
Background to land grabbing and contributory factors. Analysis of the associated risks for the population and the environment. Consideration of existing land laws and social models in the land sector.

Mann, Howard and Smaller, Carin (2009):
A Thirst for Distant Lands: Foreign investment in agricultural land and water.
International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), Foreign Investment for Sustainable Development Program.
Links between large-scale land acquisitions and availability of natural resources, especially water. Special focus on the legal framework and policies for these investments at both the international and the national level.

de Schutter, Olivier (2009):
Large-scale land acquisitions and leases: A set of core principles and measures to address the human rights challenge.
UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food.
The report analyses the possible impacts of large-scale land acquisitions on human rights, especially the right to food. It presents law-based approaches that must be taken into account when investing in land and that are actionable.

von Oppeln, Constanze and Schneider, Rafaël (2009):
Land grabbing – poor people are losing the ground beneath their feet.
German Agro Action "In Brief" No. 8.
Position paper on land grabbing; emphasising the dangers in connection with food security and the land rights of the affected farmers.

Selection of media reports:

Frankfurter Allgemeine Sonntagszeitung (01.03.2009):
Das kaufen wir euch ab.
Against the background of the political unrest in Madagascar, "large-scale land grabbing" as a "new form of agro-colonialism" is analysed.

Süddeutsche Zeitung (01.04.2009):
Die Erde wird knapp.
The focus is on the danger of food shortages in countries targeted for investments in agricultural land, a danger caused by the harvests grown on the land covered by the investments being exported.

Handelsblatt (20.04.2009):
Großinvestoren kaufen Farmland
Investments in land in developing countries are presented as a possible strategy for investing countries to secure long-term food production.

The Economist, print version (23.05.2009):
Buying farmland abroad – Outsourcing's third wave and *Cornering foreign fields*
Comprehensive presentation of the political and economic background to FDI in land. Special focus on economic impacts in the countries affected.

Neue Züricher Zeitung (13.06.2009):
Warum die Asiaten Land in Übersee erwerben and *Weltweiter Wettlauf um Agrarland in Drittweltländern*.
Presentation of the significance of investments in natural resources in terms of safeguarding food supplies. Regional focus on Asian countries and their interests in relation to direct investments in land.

Published by the

Federal Ministry for Economic
Cooperation and Development

Bonn Office
Dahlmannstraße 4
53113 Bonn
Germany
Phone +49 (0) 228 99 535 - 0
Fax +49 (0) 228 99 535 - 3500

Berlin Office
Stresemannstraße 94
10963 Berlin
Germany
Phone +49 (0) 30 18 535 - 0
Fax +49 (0) 30 18 535 - 2501

poststelle@bmz.bund.de
www.bmz.de

Editors-in-chief	Karin Foljanty *Division 314: Rural development; global food security*
	Jutta Wagner *Division 114: Development education and information*
Official responsible	Adolf Kloke-Lesch *Director-General, Global and Sectoral Policies*
	Klaus Krämer *Division 114: Development education and information*
Design and layout	Typo-Druck GmbH, Bonn
As at	August 2009

The BMZ Discourse series encompasses papers produced by the BMZ to discuss current development policy issues.