

Agricultural Investors as Development Actors (AIDA)?

A collaborative research programme prepared by

Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), Denmark

in collaboration with

- College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, Department of Agribusiness and Natural Resource Economics, Makerere University, Uganda
- Department of Agricultural Economics & Agribusiness, Sokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania, and
- Department of Geosciences and Natural Resource Management, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Contact person: Helle Munk Ravnborg, Danish Institute for International Studies, hmr@diis.dk

Programme period: March 1, 2016 – February 28, 2021

Funded through a grant from Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark through the Consultative Research Committee for Development Research.

1. Project summary

Like agricultural investors from other non-African countries, Danish farmers and institutional investors are increasingly attracted by the invitations extended by African governments to invest in agriculture as well as by the encouragement they receive to do so, e.g. from the Danish government. The range of potential development outcomes at national as well as at local livelihood level from such investments is wide. Thus, international organisations like the UN are striving to develop an institutional framework for governing such global, private investment flows in order to enhance development outcomes and safeguard human rights. The Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems (CFS-RAI) are the latest addition to this framework.

Tanzania and Uganda are among the countries that have generated interest among Danish agricultural investors. At the same time, the two countries pursue different strategies to attract foreign agricultural investments. Through a multi-layered case study approach, this project aims to enhance positive and safeguard against negative development outcomes from the growing involvement of foreign investors and investments in agricultural production in sub-Saharan Africa. Taking Danish agricultural investors as a case of foreign agricultural investors, the project explores the expectations, e.g. economic, societal, etc., that motivate investment decisions and the attention paid to emerging rights-based investment governance principles. Taking the location of Danish agricultural investments in Tanzania and Uganda as the geographical starting point, the project examines the development outcomes at sub-national level of foreign agricultural investments for people living in and using land in their vicinity. Informed by literature, and drawing on the specific research competences held by the research team, the project will in particular focus upon development outcomes with respect to employment, land tenure security and water security.

2. Background (For rationale for the selection of partner countries, please see Section 4)

New actors and new partnerships. In many ways, the recent booms in global food prices mark the end to several decades ignoring the importance of agriculture for poverty reduction, regional and global food security, and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) (e.g. Deininger, 2011; Robertson & Pinstруп-Andersen, 2010). The sustained high food price levels, and prospects of growing demands for food and biomaterial over the coming decades have stimulated not only growing land investments, but also new alliances, public-private partnerships (PPP) and investment funds designed to attract and facilitate such private-sector investment in African agriculture (e.g. Cotula, 2012; HLPE, 2011; Kaag & Zoomers, 2014; Margulis *et al.*, 2013). These include the Grow Africa partnership, and the New Alliance on Food Security & Nutrition. The newly launched Danish Agribusiness Fund (DAF) adds itself to this list of partnerships.

Expectations are high among proponents of such new partnerships. In addition to providing attractive business opportunities for companies and institutional investors, the anticipation is that such new partnerships and the investments they forge, will catalyse economic activity in SSA, and that this will generate employment, enhance food security, generate public revenues, and, through sourcing of local products and services, contract farming arrangements and improved infrastructure, improve economic opportunities for smallholder farmers, and thus ultimately contribute to reduce poverty (e.g. Deininger, 2011, Grow Africa Secretariat, 2014; Oya, 2012; World Bank, 2014). Yet, this new wave of investments in African agriculture, and in farm land in particular, has also been met with concerns and outright contestation based on fears of a neo-colonial land grab, threatening to undermine the livelihoods of people in SSA and beyond (e.g. Borras *et al.*, 2011; Cotula *et al.*, 2009; de Schutter, 2011a; GRAIN, 2008; von Braun & Meinzen-Dick, 2009). This project (AIDA) is anchored in a recognition of this wide range of development outcomes (positive as well as negative) and of the avenues through which such outcomes are shaped.

Emerging global framework for the governance of agricultural investments. In response to such hopes and fears as well as growing concerns with the limitations of national governments and voluntary CSR-inspired (corporate social responsibility) initiatives such as the UN Global Compact (Blowfield & Dolan, 2014; German, 2014; Social Watch Report 2014) and the G8-initiated Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investments (PRAI), as well as constantly evolving standards and certification schemes to govern global investment flows into agriculture (e.g. Fortin & Richardson, 2013; Ponte *et al.*, 2011; Ponte & Daugbjerg, 2015), efforts are being made to develop new sets of rights-based and broadly consulted global governance instruments (e.g. Margulis *et al.*, 2013; McKeon, 2015). These include the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGP) endorsed by the UN Human Rights Council in 2011, and the Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure (VGGT) and the Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems (CFS-RAI), both endorsed by the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), respectively in 2012 and 2014. Common to these new governance instruments is that they are flow-centred, targeting flows of capital, goods and resources, rather than territorial (Margulis *et al.*, 2013; Sikor *et al.*, 2013). Given their recent nature, limited evidence exists on their role and effectiveness in shaping agricultural investments, directly or mediated through the national terrains of policy making and implementation and wider social action (Borras *et al.*, 2013; German, 2014; Margulis *et al.*, 2013; McKeon, 2015). AIDA will contribute to document this role and build such understanding.

A focus upon foreign agricultural investors. As a further response to the concerns associated with the new wave of investments in agriculture and farm land, an impressive body of literature has burgeoned. This literature has provided a still more nuanced and empirically grounded picture of the scale and character of the land deals taking place (e.g. Anseeuw *et al.*, 2012; 2013; Borras *et al.*, 2011; Cotula *et al.*, 2014; Kaag & Zoomers, 2014; Wolford *et al.*, 2013). Among other features, the role of domestic economic and political elites in the land transactions has been increasingly highlighted, not only as intermediaries, but also as partners and investors (e.g.

Cotula *et al.*, 2014; Hall, 2011; HLPE, 2011; Peters, 2013). While acknowledging the importance of such 'new-wave' domestic agricultural investors, AIDA focusses upon foreign agricultural investors ranging from individual private investors to large corporate and institutional investors, whose investments, irrespective of scale and partnership with domestic investors, involve the acquirement of land use rights, e.g. through ownership or lease, for agricultural production.

Exploring the development outcomes on local livelihoods in a sub-national context.

Following on from this burgeoning literature which Edelman and colleagues (2013) refer to as the initial sense-making and stocktaking, there is now a move in the literature towards a wider exploration of the ramifications of this growing flow of transnational investments into land and agricultural production in SSA and beyond, and towards a more rigorous examination of its consequences for local livelihoods which currently is found to be patchy (e.g. Cotula *et al.*, 2014; Deininger & Byerlee, 2012; Edelman *et al.*, 2013). In order to fill this gap, calls are made for research to adopt a strong focus on the differentiated outcomes for different segments of local populations, and to move from a focus on single-investment case studies, to examine the cumulative outcomes of (foreign) agricultural investments and associated land deals in a broader sub-national context, e.g. in a district.

In addition to the immediate – and often negative – outcomes in terms of loss of access to land for people who used to live on, cultivate or hold e.g. grazing rights to land now acquired by an investor, the emerging literature on the development outcomes of foreign agricultural investments on local livelihoods points to a wide range of impacts such as employment and changing labour markets, economic opportunities for smallholders operating in the vicinity of and sometimes under contracts with foreign agricultural investors, land tenure, and water availability and quality (e.g. Cotula *et al.*, 2014; de Schutter, 2011b; Edelman *et al.*, 2013; FAO, 2013; Woodhouse, 2012; World Bank, 2014). Informed by this literature, and drawing on the specific research competences held by the AIDA researchers (Appendix B), AIDA will primarily focus upon development outcomes with respect to employment, land tenure security and water security.

Employment. To a 'young' continent like Africa, employment generation is evidently important and tends to be the most frequently cited societal benefit arising from the agricultural investments (World Bank, 2014). In addition to the sheer volume of direct employment generated both during establishment and as investments mature, ranging from one job per 17 to 100 hectares, depending on the crop and degree of maturity (e.g. Cotula *et al.*, 2014; Deininger *et al.*, 2011; Li, 2011; Schoneveld *et al.*, 2011; World Bank, 2014), the growing body of literature particularly on large-scale agricultural investments points to a number of other features. These include the employment foregone or displaced by the investment; the quality of the employment, i.e. its stability, salary and working conditions; and recruitment practices and the resulting socio-economic composition of the workforce (e.g. Assefa & Gibbon, forthcoming; Cramer *et al.*, 2008; Hall, 2011; Hall & Osorio, 2014; Li, 2011; Locher & Sulle, 2014; Oya, 2013; Peters, 2013; Schoneveld *et al.*, 2011; Smalley, 2013; Tyler & Dixie, 2013). In this respect, studies highlight that those who benefit from employment generated by agro-investments often are different from those bearing the costs (e.g. Schoneveld *et al.*, 2011; Smalley, 2013; Sulle *et al.*, 2014; World Bank, 2014). Even higher expectations are raised with respect to indirect employment benefits from agro-investments, e.g. through improved market conditions for surrounding smallholders through contract farming arrangements or, even more indirectly, through improved infrastructure and access to technology which often are associated with agro-investments (e.g. de Schutter 2011b; Oya, 2012; Smalley, 2013; Vermeulen & Cotula, 2010; World Bank, 2014).

While empirically-based knowledge on aggregate direct employment impacts is taking shape, our understanding of disaggregated employment impacts of agricultural investments is still sporadic (e.g. Cotula *et al.*, 2014; Oya, 2013; Smalley, 2013). AIDA will contribute to fill this gap.

Land tenure security. Tenure security is vital for land users, be they foreign agricultural investors (World Bank, 2014) or smallholders (WDR, 2008), both because it contributes to their overall well-being (de Schutter, 2011a) and because it influences decisions on investments (e.g. Ali *et al.*, 2011; Broegaard, 2005; 2013; Goldstein & Udry 2008; Lawry *et al.*, 2014; Migot-Adholla *et al.*, 1991; Place, 2009; Sjaastad & Bromley 1997; 2000). Hitherto, only limited research attention has been paid to the land tenure security impacts for smallholders and other land users surrounding agricultural investments once the land deal is settled and the investment is in operation, with some notable exceptions (e.g. Broegaard *et al.*, forthcoming; Dwyer, 2013; Hall *et al.*, 2011; Hall, 2013; Peters, 2013). Yet, even if not directly affected by the land deal, including the cases where land deals are negotiated but never implemented (e.g. Cotula, 2013; Deininger *et al.*, 2011; Locher & Sulle, 2014), surrounding smallholders may still perceive that their land tenure security has declined, e.g. due to changes in the legal status of the land instituted during the deal-making, due to fears of losing land in case the investment expands or new foreign investors arrive, or in case they, as contract farmers, breach the contract. Conversely, the interest taken by agricultural investors in a particular area may also contribute to enhance the perception of tenure security, at least for some, due to the intensified demarcation and land registration efforts often following in the wake of foreign investments. Drawing on recent research to clarify the concept of land tenure security and translate it into analytical categories (e.g. Arnot *et al.*, 2011; Broegaard, 2013; Ravnborg *et al.*, 2013; Williamson & Kerekes, 2011), AIDA will contribute to advance the field of knowledge on development outcomes of agricultural investments with respect to land tenure security in an extended temporal and spatial context reaching beyond the moment of land transaction and the location of a single investment.

Water security. Although often not explicitly mentioned in the contracts (e.g. Cotula, 2011; Woodhouse, 2012) and often left unregulated by national authorities (FAO, 2013; World Bank, 2014), observers suggest that the current wave of foreign agricultural investments in SSA and beyond may be driven by a global rush for agricultural water as much as by a global rush for land (e.g. HLPE, 2013; Mehta *et al.*, 2012; Skinner & Cotula, 2011; Smaller & Mann, 2009). Without prospects or even guarantees of secure access to irrigation water, most current foreign agricultural investments would be unlikely to have occurred (e.g. Woodhouse, 2012; World Bank, 2014). This 'silence' with respect to water demands and implications in the contracts as well as in the national efforts to regulate foreign agricultural investments¹ has until recently also characterised the academic literature on the new wave of agricultural investments. While this is now changing (e.g. Arduino *et al.*, 2012; Boelens *et al.*, 2014; Mujenja & Wonani, 2012; Van Der Zaag *et al.*, 2010; Veldwisch *et al.*, 2013), observers highlight the need to bring the water dimension of agricultural investments into the fore to fully understand their development outcomes (e.g. Cotula, 2013; Edelman *et al.*, 2013; FAO, 2013; Van Koppen *et al.*, 2013; Woodhouse, 2012; World Bank, 2014). Besides affecting the availability of water (positively through contributing to investments in water infrastructure as well as negatively through tying up large shares of available water resources) and water quality (e.g. through the use of agricultural chemicals) (e.g. Arduino *et al.*, 2012; FAO, 2013; Mujenja & Wonani, 2012; World Bank, 2014), also the legal access to water may change with the advent of agricultural investors. Many countries have embarked upon water governance reforms during the past decades. The fact that small-scale water use for domestic and productive purposes is often exempted from the obligation to obtain an administrative water right, implies that such uses are (made) invisible. This invisibility combined with the insufficient water governance capacity in many developing countries in turn implies that the water rights of domestic and smallholder water users are left unprotected by the state, rendering their legal water access highly insecure (e.g. Aagard & Ravnborg, 2006; De Stefano *et al.*, 2014; Meinzen-Dick, 2014; Ravnborg, 2014; Van Koppen *et al.*, 2013; Veldwisch *et al.*, 2013; Woodhouse, 2012). Thus, there is a particular need for examining the development outcomes in terms of water security in the intersection between

¹ Seufert (2013) describes that during the consultations of the VGGT, some governments effectively blocked the proposal to include water as part of the negotiations, implying that part of this 'silence' may be 'constructed'.

these recent waves of only partially implemented water reforms, and of water demanding foreign agricultural investments (e.g. Mehta *et al.*, 2012; Ravnborg, 2014; Van Koppen *et al.*, 2013; Woodhouse, 2012).

3. Objectives

The *development objective* of AIDA is to enhance positive – and safeguard against negative – development outcomes from the growing involvement of foreign investors in agricultural production in SSA for people living in and using land in areas receiving such investors, and thus contribute to enhance the role of foreign agricultural investors as development actors.

The range of possible development outcomes from foreign agricultural investments is wide. Through theoretically well-founded and empirically systematic research and drawing on the specific research competences held by AIDA researchers, the *research objectives* are to:

- examine the development outcomes of foreign agricultural investments for local livelihoods, particularly along the dimensions of employment, land tenure security, and water security (dependent variables);
- identify the factors which enhance positive development outcomes along these dimensions (independent variables);
- assess the role of emerging rights-based investment governance instruments in shaping agricultural investments in SSA – directly by guiding agricultural investors or indirectly as tools for national governments and civil society.

Four sets of factors are hypothesised to shape development outcomes of agro-investments:

- *investor-related factors*, e.g. type of investor, investment expectations, how development concerns contribute to motivate the investment, domestic investor partnership, prior knowledge of the investment context;
- *investment-related factors*, e.g. type of production, its organisation and labour, land, water & capital requirements, degree of conflict at establishment;
- *investment location-related factors*, e.g. social actors present, population density, land availability, other employment opportunities, presence of other foreign investments; and
- *investment country-related factors*, e.g. the investment climate, approach taken to attract & protect foreign agricultural investments, justice system, level of civil society engagement, land and environmental policies.

Through collaborative and stakeholder-engaged research based on jointly developed research protocols, the *capacity building objective* is to strengthen research capacity and the capacity for research-based stakeholder engagement, including with national investment facilitating authorities (e.g. IFU, Danida, Tanzania Investment Centre (TIC) and Uganda Investment Authority (UIA)), of involved researchers and research institutions.

4. Methodology (including rationale for the selection of partner countries)

Through a multi-layered case study approach, AIDA will employ the collection data through semi-structured as well as questionnaire-based interviews, consultation of international, national and sub-national registries and databases, including census data; and review and analysis of policy documents, using analytical tools such as NVivo, SPSS and UCINET. In developing the detailed research protocols, attention will be paid to coordinate with similar on-going research efforts in order to meet the call e.g. from FAO (2013) for the development of standards and approaches that will allow comparability between case studies of foreign agricultural investments.

Danish agricultural investors as a case of foreign agricultural investors. Foreign agricultural investors in SSA range from individual private investors, often motivated by previous contact with a community or country and investing on a relatively small scale, to large corporations and institutional investors who tend to seek larger profits on their investments and invest in agriculture alongside other sectors. As a case of this range of foreign agricultural investors and drawing on its privileged access (being based in Denmark) and the current momentum created by initiatives such as DAF with respect to agricultural investments in developing countries, AIDA focuses on Danish investors, whose investments involve the acquisition of land rights for primary production. Currently, Danish agricultural investors in SSA cover the full range of investors from private to institutional investors.² Moreover, although Denmark is far from the top agricultural investor in SSA, it ranks among the biggest outwards foreign agricultural investor countries on a global scale (Graham *et al.*, 2011; quoting UNCTAD, 2009) and observers (as in footnote 2) expect that an increasing part of this appetite for outward agricultural investment will be directed towards SSA in the years to come.

Semi-structured conversational interviews will be conducted with Danish agricultural investors at various stages of the investment process in SSA with a particular focus on Tanzania and Uganda (please see below), and with representatives from organisations facilitating their investment,³ particularly to examine the *investor-related factors* on motivation, expectations, etc. The interviews will be conducted face to face in Denmark, Tanzania and Uganda or through skype if necessary. As interviews may concern actual, previous (successful and less successful), and future agricultural investments, possible requests for anonymity will be duly respected. Protocols for these interviews will be developed at the AIDA workshop I.

Tanzania and Uganda as cases of investment countries. In order to empirically examine the importance of *investment country-related factors*, Tanzania and Uganda are chosen as case countries as two African countries which have pursued different strategies to attract foreign agricultural investments and which, at least hitherto, have experienced different levels of exposure to foreign agricultural investments and associated incidences of local contestations.

According to the Land Matrix (www.landmatrix.org; database downloaded February 1, 2015) Tanzania ranks third (following Mozambique and Ethiopia) among African countries as targets for land deals. Tanzania has chosen to take active part in both the G8 New Alliance partnership and the Grow Africa initiative in an effort to attract foreign agricultural investments (Cooksey, 2013). Already in 2010, Tanzania launched its Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania (SAGCOT) as a PPP 'to develop the agricultural potential of the region and thus improve food security, reduce rural poverty and ensure environmental sustainability' (www.sagcot.com; accessed August 26, 2014). Despite some success, TIC calls for continued efforts to make agriculture more attractive to investors, including through building up a reliable land bank (TIC, 2013). So far, most of the large-scale investments in Tanzania have been associated with biofuel development, and in several instances they have been contested locally. In an effort to accommodate such local concerns, the Tanzanian government has put a ceiling of 10,000 hectares on large-scale land acquisitions for sugar cane (Tanzania Daily News, November 28, 2012) and has moreover made mandatory provisions for out-grower schemes and for food crop production (Cotula *et al.*, 2014; FAO, 2013; Sulle & Nelson, 2009).

² Personal communication with market and international advisors in Danish Agriculture and Food Council (DAFC), Organic Denmark as well as independent advisors and with Danish Farmers Abroad (DFA); as well as consultation of IFU project database and the Land Matrix database. Based on initial interviews, we have information of 17 Danish private & institutional agro-investments in Tanzania and Uganda.

³ Contacts have been established with Danish farmer interest organisations, including the Africa network of the DAFC, Organic Denmark, and DFA, and all have expressed willingness to facilitate the establishment of this overview.

While equally keen to attract foreign agricultural investments, Uganda has so far not joined PPPs such as the Grow Africa initiative and the New Alliance. Instead Uganda seeks to attract foreign agricultural investments through its modernised investment authority (UIA). Moreover, the Ugandan policy is to encourage foreign investments to promote rather than displace domestic production and thus to significantly limit opportunities for foreign investors to acquire land rights in their own name. Instead joint ventures and partnerships with existing land rights holders are promoted (Stickler, 2012). Foreign agricultural investment in Uganda is low, but growing (FAO, 2013; Zeemeijer, 2011), and Uganda ranks 15th among African countries as target for land deals (www.landmatrix.org; database downloaded February 1, 2015).

Due to these different trajectories, the choice of Tanzania and Uganda enables the comparative analysis of the role of national government efforts, and of international PPPs more widely, in attracting as well as in contributing to shape the development outcomes of foreign agricultural investments. To achieve this, reviews of policy documents as well as regular interviews with policy makers and civil servants involved in facilitating as well as governing the investments and their outcomes will be conducted. Protocols for these interviews and data collection efforts will be developed at the AIDA workshop I.

Danish agricultural investments as geographical starting point for selection of locations of (clusters of) agricultural investments. Informed by a mapping of foreign agricultural investments in Tanzania and Uganda undertaken e.g. on the basis of registries maintained by TIC and UIA, informal business networks, civil society organisations (CSOs), etc. and taking the location of Danish agricultural investments as the geographical starting point, 2-3 locations with presence of (clusters of) Danish and possibly other foreign agricultural investors will be selected. The investment locations will be selected from a maximum variation sampling strategy with respect to the *investment location-related factors* and the types of investments they house. The investment locations will be delimited according to district or division/sub-county boundaries, depending on the scale of the investment(s) and the patterns of economic and social interactions taking place between inhabitants, organisations and companies, e.g. employing the concept of 'functional territories' (Berdegúe *et al.*, in press). This will take place at the AIDA workshop I. Combined these locations are expected to house 8–12 Danish agricultural investments. These and, if present, other foreign agricultural investments, will be characterised in-depth with respect to the *investment-related factors*.

In order to identify and examine the development outcomes of the investments in the locations selected, semi-structured interviews and focal group discussions will be conducted with different segments of the population living, working, and using land and water resources in each of the selected locations as well as with people who have been dispossessed of their access to land and water by the investment(s). These interviews will serve to identify issues and perceptions with respect to the investments and the ways in which they affect – positively and negatively – local livelihoods in general and along the dimensions of employment, land tenure security, and water security, in particular. Protocols for these interviews will be developed at AIDA workshop I. Combined with issues emerging from the literature and interviews with investors and other stakeholders, the semi-structured interviews will inform the development of a questionnaire to be administered to a random sample of approximately 400 respondents in each location (i.e. a total of 4-6 samples of 400 respondents) which will contribute to the assessment of the differentiated development outcomes for different segments of the population in a sub-national context. The questionnaire will be developed at the AIDA workshop II. Cross-locational comparisons within and between the two countries drawing and triangulating data from all sources, will enable the assessment of location- and investment-related factors in shaping development outcomes. This analysis and drawing of conclusions and preliminary policy recommendations will take place at the AIDA workshop III.

All semi-structured interviews will be recorded (audio or on paper), and written summaries or transcripts will subsequently be coded using NVivo, using codes that are jointly developed as part of the interview protocols. Data generated through questionnaire-based interviews will be jointly processed and analysed using SPSS. Finally, drawing on data from both the semi-structured and the questionnaire-based interviews, social network analysis will be performed, using UCINET, to identify the ways in which different segments of the population of the investment locations relate and interact with investors.

5. Expected outcomes and outputs

Based on its research results and stakeholder engagement efforts, AIDA aspires to stimulate changes in policies and practice of institutions that facilitate and regulate foreign agricultural investments such as TIC, UIA and IFU, and local authorities such as district governments, land and water authorities and community organisations, as well as among investors themselves in order to enhance the development outcomes of foreign agricultural investments. In addition, through cross-scale empirical research on how investment decisions are shaped, AIDA expects to contribute to ongoing efforts to develop a framework for the global governance of agricultural investments of which UNGP, PRAI, VGGT and CFS-RAI are part.

Through PhD training and shared collaborative research between Tanzanian, Ugandan and Danish researchers and early engagement with policy makers and with similar international research initiatives, skills in analysing and communicating development outcomes of foreign agricultural investment in SSA will be enhanced.

AIDA stakeholders include (a) government agencies in host countries, e.g. TIC & UIA; (b) government agencies in Denmark, e.g. Danida, Danish embassies in Tanzania & Uganda, IFU; (c) Danish agricultural investors & their interest organisations; (d) community members and local authorities in selected locations; (e) CSOs e.g. farmer organisations in Tanzania & Uganda; (f) international institutions such as NEPAD, CFS, FAO, World Bank & UNCTAD; and (g) related international research initiatives. Contacts are already established with interest organisations, including the Africa Network of the Danish Agriculture & Food Council, Organic Denmark, and DFA, which have expressed commitment to participate and facilitate the research.

AIDA will deliver the following outputs: (a) 4 south-based PhDs; (b) enhanced research capacity in Denmark, Tanzania and Uganda; (c) 8-10 peer-reviewed articles; (d) a book anthology or special issue of journal; (e) 4 policy briefs; (f) 12-15 articles/appearance in national media (g) 2-3 conferences panels; (h) 1-2 audio-visuals and associated video clips; (i) 10-12 working papers; (j) 3x3 national stakeholder platform meetings; (k) a project home-page; and (l) overviews of Danish agricultural investments in SSA, with particular focus on Tanzania and Uganda, as well as of foreign agricultural investments in Tanzania and Uganda.

6. Relevance

AIDA places itself centrally within Theme 2 by examining the emerging engagement of Danish private and institutional investors as new development actors in African agriculture; the way in which their participation is shaped by PPPs such as DAF and Danida Business Partnerships (DBP), as well as by emerging (rights-based) global governance instruments, and the development outcomes of such investments along dimensions (employment, water & land tenure security) which figure prominently among the strategic objectives of Danish development cooperation.

Besides offering possibility for comparative analysis, Tanzania and Uganda are chosen as case countries due to their long (agricultural) cooperation with Denmark, the importance of agriculture to their development strategies and as a priority sector for forming business partnerships with Danish investors, cf. DBP profiles, and the interest taken in these two countries from actual and potential Danish agricultural investors (e.g. from institutional investors, Danish Farmers Abroad among others).

Finally many African governments, including those of Tanzania and Uganda, strongly encourage private investments not only to boost agricultural growth, but also to generate employment and engage smallholders. This resonates strongly with the Danish priorities on green growth and employment.

7. Project plan – Main activities, milestones and outputs (for tentative publication titles, please refer to log frame document)

Activities & milestones	Out-puts	2016			2017			2018			2019			2020			2021
		Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1
Project management																	
Contracts & accounting procedures; research permits																	
Announce PhD positions, interview & select candidates																	
AIDA webpage establishment (to be regularly updated); DFC reporting	k																
PhDs & contribution to capacity building																	
PhD start; develop PhD concept notes, 1st draft	a																
PhD DK stay (I: Proposals, NVivo, etc.; II: analysis & writing)	b																
PhD proposal presentation and acceptance (home university)	a																
Contribution to PhD training course (Danish researchers)	b																
Writing PhD thesis & hand in; PhD defence	a																
AIDA workshops																	
I (methods); II (comparative analysis); III (conclusions & recommendations)	b																
Overview & literature reviews																	
Identify DK investors & investments and make typology & database	l																
Literature reviews	i																
Update investor & investment databases	l																
Field work, including questionnaire survey																	
Collective fieldwork I-IV in TZ and UG (interviews & focal groups)																	
Questionnaire survey																	
Analysis & writing																	
Joint comparative analysis of fieldwork material	b+i																
Writing articles & book chapters	c+d																
Dissemination & policy/stakeholder engagement																	
Initial contact to related international research initiatives	g																
National platform meetings – Denmark	j																
National platform meetings – Tanzania	j																
National platform meetings – Uganda	j																
Feedback to local population & institutions	j																
Policy briefs; newspaper articles/national media appearance	e+f																
Audio-visuals (I: expectations, motivation, hopes & fears; II: outcomes)	h																
Conference panels presentation & AIDA conference	g																

8. Participants, organisation and management

The AIDA team consists of Danish, Tanzanian and Ugandan researchers and combines different disciplines and extensive experience from research and policy work on rural development, economics, and land and water governance in developing countries in Eastern Africa and beyond, and with experience from multi-country research & coordination.

The AIDA team met in Morogoro in February 2015 to further develop the AIDA proposal and complement the team composition.

Project coordination will take place through regular email and skype contact as well as through the three AIDA workshops envisaged with participation of all team members. AIDA adopts a matrix-like organisational structure combining country teams with thematic focal and cross-country thematic work. **H.M. Ravnborg**, DIIS, will be the project coordinator and the thematic focal point on emerging rights-based framework to govern agricultural investments as well as on water security impacts. **E. Lazaro**, SUA, will be the Tanzania scientific team coordinator and will be the thematic focal point for employment impact analyses. **K. Mutabazi**, SUA, will be the Tanzania administrative and financial team coordinator and the focal point for African initiatives aimed to attract and govern agricultural investments. E. Lazaro and K. Mutabazi will be administratively assisted by **NN5. B. Bashaasha**, MAK, will be the Uganda team coordinator and the thematic focal point for the analysis of wider economic effects of foreign investments. Due to obligations as College Principal until 2017, B. Bashaasha will be seconded as the Uganda team coordinator by **D. Tumusiime**, MAK, as well as **H. Sseguya**, MAK, for PhD supervision. B. Bashaasha and D. Tumusiime will be administratively assisted by **NN6. R.B. Broegaard**, UC, will serve as the Danish team coordinator and the thematic focal point on land tenure security impacts. **S. Chipeta**, GDA (formerly DAAS), will be the thematic focal point on Danish farmers as agricultural investors and development actors. Country coordinators will take responsibility for stakeholder engagement and national coordination of research work while the thematic focal points will provide intellectual leadership within their theme, including to the development of data collection and analytical strategy.

One PhD candidate in each of the two countries (**NN1 & NN3**) will focus on employment impacts while PhD candidates **NN2 & NN4** will focus on land tenure security and water access impacts in their respective countries. Lazaro, Mutabazi, Bashaasha, Tumusiime and Sseguya will serve as PhD supervisors, with Ravnborg and Broegaard as co-supervisors. Enrolment of PhD candidates at the regional Agricultural and Rural Innovation PhD programme in which MAK, SUA and UC take part, will be explored. Ravnborg, Broegaard and Chipeta will take active part in fieldwork in Tanzania and Uganda as well as in Denmark.⁴ The PhD positions will be publically announced and candidates selected by a joint assessment committee at the onset of the project.

Through the participation of Lazaro, AIDA will benefit directly from knowledge being generated through the FFU-funded RUT project on rural-urban linkages of particular relevance for the contextualisation of the analysis of employment impacts of agricultural investments.

9. Research capacity strengthening

⁴ In addition to interviews held in Denmark, participation in project workshops in the three countries, joint data processing and analysis and PhD supervision, four periods of joint fieldwork in Tanzania and Uganda are envisaged during 2017-2019.

AIDA aims to strengthen research capacity as well as the capacity for research-based policy dialogue of the involved researchers and research institutions. Four PhD candidates will be jointly supervised from the host institutions and by their Danish co-supervisors, including during joint fieldwork and during study stays in Denmark. While in Denmark, PhD candidates are expected to participate in relevant PhD courses. In addition, the Danish participants will avail themselves for contributing to PhD courses held at SUA and MAK, as feasible. A virtual AIDA library consisting of relevant academic literature has already been established and shared among AIDA team members through a dropbox folder and will be regularly updated.

10. International dimension

AIDA situates itself within and will contribute to an evolving field of research on and the development of policy and governance responses to the growing involvement of foreign agricultural investors in agriculture not only in Africa but also in other parts of the developing world. Contacts will be established to ongoing international research initiatives and institutions such as the Land and Agricultural Commercialisation in Africa programme coordinated by PLAAS, South Africa, the Land Deal Politics Initiative, IIED, and IFPRI as well as to convening international organisations such as FAO, CFS, and the African Union. In this respect, AIDA draws upon the international contacts that the involved researchers have established, particularly within the fields of agricultural and rural development (e.g. Rimisp; Centre for Land Tenure Studies, Norwegian University of Life Sciences); land tenure (e.g. Land Tenure Centre, University of Wisconsin-Madison; World Bank; ILC); and water governance (Wageningen Agricultural University; IWMI).

11. New knowledge

Given the recent nature of the new wave of foreign agricultural investments in SSA, so far research has primarily focused on the immediate and direct consequences of the investments and the land transactions they involve, aiming to assess their magnitude, how they are negotiated, and their direct employment effect. Calls are now emerging to broaden and deepen the scope of research on agricultural investments by addressing additional dimensions and examining the cumulative effects of agricultural investments at the sub-national level, and by disaggregating and identifying the differentiated impacts which the investments may entail.

AIDA wishes to respond to this call by providing new and systematic empirical knowledge on the development outcomes of foreign agricultural investments by focussing upon the differentiated livelihood impacts investments may entail with respect to employment, and with respect to land tenure security and water security. Thereby, building on previous experiences and specific research competences within the AIDA team, AIDA will further develop the recent focus on perceived tenure security and contribute to the literature on water governance reform and the formalisation of water rights in the context of an increasingly globalised food system which hitherto has drawn primarily upon research conducted in a Latin American context.

12. Publication and dissemination strategy

With a view to the AIDA development objective, AIDA aims to engage itself with relevant stakeholders from the onset of the project, both to inform the research and to foster an interest in and ownership to research results among stakeholders. This will be achieved by the establishment of national stakeholder platforms counting the participation of investor representatives, their interest organisations, investment facilitation agencies, CSOs,

community representatives, and local authorities. A minimum of three platform meetings are envisaged in each of the three countries during the project period. Our initial contacts with (potential) Danish investors and their interest organisations as well as CSOs, community representatives, and local authorities indicate a genuine interest in accompanying, contributing to and learning from AIDA.

Research results will be disseminated through a suite of products aiming at reaching different audiences and achieving different outcomes. AIDA working papers serve to communicate intermediate findings to academic and non-academic stakeholders. Working papers will be presented at international conferences and at national platform meetings and will form the basis for the elaboration of manuscripts for peer-reviewed journal articles in leading (rural) development journals and (edited) book (chapters). Inspired by issues arising during national platform meetings as well as international debates, and drawing on our research results, policy briefs and news media inputs, including articles, will be prepared.

Finally, as a means to ease and enrich dialogue with immediate stakeholders as well as with a wider public audience, an audio-visual and an associated set of video clips will be produced, following agricultural investors and their receiving communities during the timespan of the AIDA project to illustrate the sets of motivations, expectations, hopes and fears associated with foreign agricultural investments. Facilitated by the matrix-inspired organisation into country as well as thematic teams, co-authorship will be emphasized and the AIDA workshops and PhD study stays will serve as key moments for manuscript conception and review.

13. Strategy for phasing out

The enhanced research capacity generated through AIDA will be firmly anchored within national universities and research institutes and within the regional PhD programme ARI, AIDA pledges in addition to establish national platforms for policy and policy implementation dialogue between different stakeholders related to foreign agricultural investments, and together with participants in these platforms to explore how these platforms may be sustained beyond the AIDA project period, including through the involvement of AIDA researchers. Moreover, on a cost-neutral basis, AIDA partners will commit to make their research-based knowledge derived from AIDA available for national – and international – stakeholders beyond the AIDA project period.⁵

14. References

- Aagaard, C.A. and Ravnborg H.M. 2006 "Water reform – implications for rural poor people's access to water", *DIIS Brief*, Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies.
- Anseeuw, W., M. Boche, T. Breu, M. Giger, J. Lay, P. Messerli and K. Nolte. 2012. Transnational land deals for agriculture in the global south. Analytical report based on the land matrix database. In *Landmatrix*, 64. Rome: The Land Matrix Partnership (CDE, CIRAD, GIGA, GIZ, ILC).
- Anseeuw, W., J. Lay, P. Messerli, M. Giger and M. Taylor. 2013. Creating a public tool to assess and promote transparency in global land deals: The experience of the land matrix. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 40(3): 521-30.

⁵ In a previous FFU funded project, *Competing for Water*, the Nicaraguan research team was encouraged to – and took upon itself – to sustain the national platform on water governance beyond the project period through the critical period of establishment of a new institutional framework for water governance in the country. Moreover, requests for contributing to public debate and policy dialogue on the basis of knowledge generated through the project are continuously being honoured – see www.diis.dk/water.

- Ali, D.A.; S. Dercon; and M. Gautam. 2011. "Property rights in a very poor country: tenure insecurity and investment in Ethiopia". *Agricultural Economics* 42, 75–86
- Arduino, S., G. Colombo, O.M. Ocampo and L. Panzeri. 2012. "Contamination of community potable water from land grabbing: A case study from rural Tanzania." *Water Alternatives* 5(2): 344-59.
- Arnot, C.D., M.K. Luckert and P.C. Boxall. 2011. What is tenure security? Conceptual implications for empirical analysis. *Land Economics* 87, no 2: 297-311.
- Assefa, M. and P. Gibbon. *Forthcoming*. "Labour markets for irrigated agriculture in central ethiopia: Wage premiums and segmentation." Manuscript re-submitted to *World Development*.
- Berdegue, J.A.; Carriazo, F.; Jara, B.; Modrego, F.; and Soloaga, I. In press. "Cities, Territories, and Inclusive Growth: Unraveling Urban–Rural Linkages in Chile, Colombia, and Mexico." *World Development*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.12.013>
- Blowfield, Michael and Dolan, Catherine S. 2014. "Business as a development agent: evidence of possibility and improbability." *Third World Quarterly*, 35:1, 22-42, DOI: 10.1080/01436597.2013.868982.
- Boelens, Rutgerd; Gaybor, Antonio; and Hendriks, Jan. 2014. "Water Grabbing in the Andean Region: Illustrative Cases from Peru and Ecuador". In Kaag, Mayke; and Zoomers, Annelies. Eds. 2014. *The Global Land Grab. Beyond the Hype*. Zed Books. Chapter 6.
- Borras, S.M., R. Hall, I. Scoones, B. White and W. Wolford. 2011. Towards a better understanding of global land grabbing: An editorial introduction. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38, no 2: 209-16. Special Issue.
- Borras, S.M., J.C. Franco and C. Wang. 2013. The challenge of global governance of land grabbing: Changing international agricultural context and competing political views and strategies. *Globalizations* 10(1): 161-79.
- Broegaard, R. 2005. Land tenure insecurity and inequality in Nicaragua. *Development and Change* 36(5): 845-64.
- Broegaard, R.B. 2013. Biting the barefoot: Land titles and tenure security in the context of inequality. In *DIIS Report 2013:32*. Copenhagen: DIIS.
- Broegaard, R. B.; T. Vongvisouk & O. Mertz. *Forthcoming*. "Contradictory land use plans and policies in Laos: Hope for tenure security and threats of exclusion." Manuscript re-submitted to *Journal of Peasant Studies*.
- Cooksey, B. 2013. What difference has CAADP made to Tanzanian agriculture? FAC Political Economy of Agricultural Policy in Africa PEAPA, 35. Brighton; Future Agricultures Consortium.
- Cotula, L. 2011. *Land Deals in Africa: What is in the Contracts?* London: IIED.
- Cotula, L. 2012. "The International Political Economy of the Global Land Rush: A critical appraisal of trends, scale, geography and drivers." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 39:3-4, 649-680.
- Cotula, L. 2013. *The Great African Land Grab? Agricultural investments and the global food system*. African Arguments. London & New York: Zed.
- Cotula, L.; S. Vermeulen; R. Leonard; and J. Keeley. 2009. *Land Grab or Development Opportunity? Agricultural investments and international land deals in Africa*. London/Rome: IIED, FAO and IFAD.
- Cotula, L., C. Oya, E.A. Codjoe, A. Eid, M. Kakraba-Ampeh, J. Keeley, A.L. Kidewa, M. Makwarimba, W.M. Seide, W.O. Nasha, R.O. Asare and M. Rizzo. 2014. Testing claims about large land deals in Africa: Findings from a multi-country study. *Journal of Development Studies* 50(7): 903-25.
- Cramer, C.; Oya, C.; and Sender, J. 2008. "Rural labour markets in sub-Saharan Africa" *Policy Brief*, 5. London: SOAS, Center for Development Policy and Research.
- de Schutter, O. 2011a. "How not to think of land-grabbing: three critiques of large-scale investments in farmland." *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38:2, 249-279

- de Schutter, O. 2011b. The right to food, Interim report to UN General Assembly 21: United Nations General Assembly. A/66/262.
- De Stefano, Lucia *et al.* 2014. "Reforming Water Governance Structures". In Willaarts, Bárbara A.; Garrido, Alberto; and Llamas, M. Ramón. Eds. 2014. Water for Food Security and Well-Being in Latin America and the Caribbean. Social and Environmental Implications for a Globalized Economy. London and New York: Routledge. Chapter 11, 285-315.
- Deininger, Klaus. 2011. "Challenges Posed by the New Wave of Farmland Investment". *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38(2):2017-247.
- Deininger, K. and D. Byerlee. 2012. "The Rise of Large Farms in Land Abundant Countries: Do They Have a Future?" *World Development*, 40(4): 701-714.
- Deininger, Klaus and Byerlee, Derek; with Lindsay, Jonathan; Norton, Andrew; Selod, Harris; and Stickler, Mercedes. 2011. *Rising Global Interest in Farmland. Can it yield sustainable and equitable benefits?* Washington D.C.: The World Bank.
- Dwyer, M. 2013. "Building the politics machine: Tools for 'resolving' the global land grab." *Development and Change* 44(2): 309-33.
- Edelman, M; Oya, C.; and Borras JR, S.M. 2013. "Global Land Grabs: historical processes, theoretical and methodological implications and current trajectories." *Third World Quarterly* 34(9): 1517-1531.
- FAO. 2013. *Trends and Impacts of Foreign Investment in Developing Country Agriculture. Evidence from case studies.* Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- Fortin, Elizabeth and Richardson, Ben. 2013. "Certification Schemes and the Governance of Land: Enforcing Standards or Enabling Scrutiny?" *Globalizations*, 10(1): 141-159.
- German, L. 2014. "Multi-Sited Governance of Large-Scale Land Acquisitions: Mapping and Evaluating the Terrain". *Review of Policy Research*, 31(3):218-252.
- Goldstein, M. and C. Udry. 2008. The profits of power: Land rights and agricultural investment in Ghana. *Journal of Political Economy* 116(6): 981-1022.
- Graham, A.; Aubry, S.; Künnemann, R. and Suárez, S.M. 2011. "The Role of the EU in Land Grabbing in Africa - CSO Monitoring 2009-2010 "Advancing African Agriculture" (AAA): The Impact of Europe's Policies and Practices on African Agriculture and Food Security". Paper presented at the International Conference on Global Land Grabbing, 6-8 April 2011, Organised by the Land Deals Politics Initiative (LDPI) in collaboration with the Journal of Peasant Studies and hosted by the Future Agricultures Consortium at the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex.
- GRAIN. 2008. *Seized! The 2008 Land Grab for Food and Financial Security.* GRAIN.
- Grow Africa Secretariat. 2014. "Grow Africa. 2nd Annual Report on private sector investment in support of country-led transformations in African agriculture". Available at: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/221444500/Grow-Africa-Annual-Report-2014>
- Hall, D. 2013. "Primitive Accumulation, Accumulation by Dispossession and the Global Land Grab." *Third World Quarterly* 34(9): 1582-1604.
- Hall, D., P. Hirsch and T.M. Li. 2011. *Powers of Exclusion: Land Dilemmas in Southeast Asia.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Hall, R. 2011. Land grabbing in southern Africa: The many faces of the investor rush. *Review of African Political Economy* 38(128): 193-214.
- Hall, R. and M. Osorio. 2014. Agricultural investment, gender and land in Africa: Towards inclusive, equitable and socially responsive investment. In *Agricultural Investment, Gender and Land in Africa*, 77. Cape Town: PLAAS.
- HLPE. 2011. "Land Tenure and International Investments in Agriculture. A report by the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security" HLPE Report No. 2. Rome: FAO.
- HLPE. 2013. "Biofuels and food security", report by the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security." Report No. 5. Rome: FAO.
- Kaag, Mayke and Zoomers, Annelies. Eds. 2014. *The Global Land Grab. Beyond the Hype.* London & New York: Zed Books.

- Lawry, S., C. Samii, R. Hall, A. Leopold, D. Hornby and F. Mtero. 2014. The impact of land property rights interventions on investment and agricultural productivity in developing countries: A systematic review. In *Campbell Systematic Reviews*.
- Li, T.M. 2011. "Centering labor in the land grab debate." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38(2): 281-98.
- Locher, M. and E. Sulle. 2014. Challenges and methodological flaws in reporting the global land rush: Observations from Tanzania. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 41(4): 569-92.
- Margulis, Matias E.; McKeon, Nora and Borrás Jr., Saturnino M. 2013. "Land Grabbing and Global Governance: Critical Perspectives", *Globalizations*, 10:1, 1-23. *Special Issue*.
- McKeon, Nora. 2015. *Food Security Governance: Empowering Communities, Regulating Corporations*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Meinzen-Dick, R. 2014. "Property rights and sustainable irrigation: A developing country perspective." *Agricultural Water Management* 145: 23-31.
- Metha, L., G.J. Veldwisch and J. Franco. 2012. "Introduction to the special issue: Water grabbing? Focus on the (re)appropriation of finite water resources." *Water Alternatives* 5(2): 193-207.
- Migot-Adholla, S., P. Hazell, B. Benoît and F. Place. 1991. Indigenous land rights systems in sub-Saharan Africa: A constraint on productivity? *The World Bank Economic Review* 5(1): 155-75.
- Mujenja, F. and C. Wonani. 2012. "Long-term outcomes of agricultural investments. Lessons from Zambia." In *Land, investments and rights*, 68. London: IIED.
- Oya, C. 2012. "Contract Farming in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Survey of Approaches, Debates and Issues." *Journal of Agrarian Change* 12(1), 1-33.
- Oya, C. 2013. Rural wage employment in Africa: Methodological issues and emerging evidence. *Review of African Political Economy* 40(136): 251-73.
- Peters, P.E. 2013. Land Appropriation, Surplus People and a Battle over Visions of Agrarian Futures in Africa. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 40(3): 537-62.
- Place, F. 2009. Land tenure and agricultural productivity in Africa: A comparative analysis of the economics literature and recent policy strategies and reforms. *World Development* 37(8): 1326-36.
- Ponte, Stefano; Gibbon, Peter; and Vestergaard, Jakob. Eds. 2011. *Governing through Standards: Origins, Drivers and Limitations*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ponte, Stefano and Daugbjerg, Carsten. 2015. "Biofuel Sustainability and the Formation of Transnational Hybrid Governance", *Environmental Politics*, 24:1, 96-114.
- Ravnborg, Helle Munk. 2014. "Water competition, water governance and food security." Christoplos, I. and A. Pain. Eds. 2014. *New Challenges to Food Security: From Climate Change to Fragile States*. Chapter 6, Pp. 109-22. Routledge.
- Ravnborg, H.M., B. Bashaasha, R.H. Pedersen, R. Spichiger and A. Turinawe. 2013. Land tenure under transition - tenure security, land institutions and economic activity in Uganda. *DIIS Working Paper* 2013:03. Copenhagen: DIIS.
- Robertson, B. and Per Pinstrup-Andersen. 2010. "Global Land Acquisition: Neo-Colonialism or Development Opportunity?" *Food Security* 2:271-283.
- Schoneveld, G.C., L.A. German and E. Nutakor. 2011. Land-based investments for rural development? A grounded analysis of the local impacts of biofuel feedstock plantations in Ghana. *Ecology and Society* 16:4 10.
- Seufert, Philip. 2013. "The FAO Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests", *Globalizations*, 10:1, 181-186.
- Sikor, Thomas; Auld, Graeme; Bebbington, Anthony; Benjaminsen, Tor A.; Gentry, Bradford S.; Hunsberger, Carol; Izac, Anne-Marie; Margulis, Matias E.; Plieninger, Tobias; Schroeder, Heike; and Upton, Caroline. 2013. "Global Land Governance: From Territory to Flow?" *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 5:522-527.
- Sjaastad, E. and D.W. Bromley. 1997. Indigenous land rights in sub-Saharan Africa: Appropriation, security and investment demand. *World Development* 25, no 4: pp. 549-62.

- Sjaastad, E. and D.W. Bromley. 2000. The prejudices of property rights: On individualism, specificity, and security in property regimes. *Development Policy Review* 18, no 4: 365-89.
- Skinner, J. and L. Cotula. 2011. "Are land deals driving 'water grabs'?" In *Briefing. The global land rush*, 4. London: IIED.
- Smaller, C. and H. Mann. 2009. *A thirst for distant lands: Foreign investment in agricultural land and water*, 1-16. Winnipeg: International Institute for Sustainable Development.
- Smalley, R. 2013. *Plantations, contract farming and commercial farming areas in Africa: A comparative review*, 73. Brighton: Future Agricultures Consortium.
- Social Watch Report. 2014. *Means and Ends*. A Global Progress Report on Poverty Eradication and Gender Equality.
- Stickler, M.M. 2012. Governance of Large-Scale Land Acquisitions in Uganda: The role of the Uganda Investment Authority. Paper presented at the International Conference on Global Land Grabbing II, October 17-19, 2012, Organized by the Land Deals Politics Initiative (LDPI) and hosted by the Department of Development Sociology at Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.
- Sulle, E. and Nelson, F. 2009. *Biofuels, Land Access and Rural Livelihoods in Tanzania*. London: IIED.
- Sulle, E.; R. Smalley and L. Malale. 2014. "Opportunities and Challenges in Tanzania's Sugar Industry: Lessons for SAGCOT and the New Alliance. *FCA/PLAAS Policy Brief*, 12. Cape Town: PLAAS/FAC
- TIC. 2013. *Tanzania Investment Report 2012. Foreign Private Investment and Investor Perception*. Dar es Salaam: Tanzania Investment Centre.
- Tyler, G. and Dixie, G. 2013. *Investing in Agribusiness: A Retrospective View of a Development Bank's Investments in Agribusiness in Africa and Southeast Asia and the Pacific*. Agriculture and Environmental Services Discussion paper 01. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- UNCTAD. 2009. *World Investment Report 2009*. Geneva: UNCTAD.
- Van Der Zaag, P., D. Juizo, A. Vilanculos, A. Bolding and N.P. Uiterweer. 2010. "Does the Limpopo river basin have sufficient water for massive irrigation development in the plains of Mozambique?" *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C* 35, no 13-14: 832-37.
- Van Koppen, B., P. Van Der Zaag, E. Manzungu and B. Tapela. 2013. Roman water law in rural Africa: The unfinished business of colonial dispossession. *Water International* 39(1): 49-62.
- Veldwisch, G.J., W. Beekman and A. Bolding. 2013. "Smallholder irrigators, water rights and investments in agriculture: Three cases from rural Mozambique." *Water Alternatives* 6(1): 125-41.
- Vermeulen, S. and L. Cotula. 2010. *Making the most of agricultural investments: A survey of business models that provide opportunities for smallholders*. Rome, London, Bern: FAO, IIED and IFAD and SDC.
- von Braun, J. and R. Meinzen-Dick. 2009. "Land Grabbing' by Foreign Investors in Developing Countries: Risks and Opportunities." *IFPRI Policy Brief* 13. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- WDR. 2008. *Agriculture for development. World Development Report 2008*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Williamson, C.R. and C.B. Kerekes. 2011. Securing private property: Formal versus informal institutions. *Journal of Law and Economics* 54, no 3: 537-372.
- Wolford, W.; Borrás Jr., S.; Hall, R.; Scoones, I.; and White, B. 2013. "Governing Global Land Deals: The Role of the State in the Rush for Land." *Development and Change* 44(2): 189-210. Special Issue.
- Woodhouse, P. 2012. "New Investment, Old Challenges. Land deals and the water constraint in African agriculture." *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 39(3-4): 777-794.
- World Bank. 2014. The practice of responsible investment principles in larger-scale agricultural investments. Implications for corporate performance and impact on local communities. In *Agriculture and Environmental Services Discussion Paper*, 80. Washington D.C.: World Bank & UNCTAD.

Zeemeijer, I. 2011. Who Gets What, When and How? New Corporate Land Acquisitions and the Impact on Local Livelihoods in Uganda. MSc thesis. Utrecht University.