A woman in Tsholotsho District in Zimbabwe is participating in a pilot project to develop drought-resistant crops and learn simple methods to effectively grow produce (2016). Photo: Sven Torfinn/Oxfam Novib.

FINANCING WOMEN FARMERS

The need to increase and redirect agriculture and climate adaptation resources
SUMMARY

Oxfam analysis finds that governments and donors are failing to provide women farmers with relevant and adequate support for farming and adapting to climate change. Oxfam conducted research on government and donor investments in Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines and Tanzania. Funding in these countries is significantly lower than commitments that have been made, and there is little evidence of resources and technical assistance reaching women farmers. Resources are being diverted to priorities other than smallholder farmers, and for the most part governments lack the capacity to deliver funding to them.

Highlights from the findings include:

- Data analysis confirms there is no evidence of money reaching women farmers, as all of the reviewed countries are failing to gather gender-specific data.
- Only Ethiopia has reached the Maputo target of spending 10 percent of its national budget on agriculture, although this target was already met in 2003 at the time of the Maputo Declaration.
- Ghana invested almost half of its international climate change adaptation funding to support agriculture in 2014, while the women’s ministry received on average 0.1 percent of the government’s climate change budget in 2010–15.
- Nigeria had the lowest share of spending on agriculture and rural development (4.9 percent) as part of international aid in 2007–15.
- Of 3,000 farmers surveyed in Tanzania, about 80 percent reported not receiving extension services.
- In the Philippines, the public works department, which is responsible for infrastructure development, received 88 percent of climate adaptation funding in 2017, while agriculture received just 6 percent.
- In Pakistan in 2014, almost 99 percent of the funding for climate change adaptation was given in the form of loans, with grants amounting to only $3.4m.

Women farmers play a central role in reversing poverty and food insecurity, and building resilience to climate change. About 80 percent of the world’s food is produced by family farms, and small-scale farming is the dominant livelihood in most developing countries. Women farmers make up on average 43 percent of this agricultural labour in developing countries, but are the majority in some countries. However, they produce 20–30 percent less than men farmers because they often face barriers to accessing farm inputs, markets, technical assistance, extension services and finances. Equalizing this gap could boost agricultural output and decrease global undernourishment by up to 17 percent.
Women farmers face two compounding layers of exclusion—as smallholder farmers and as women. Low levels of government spending on agriculture and climate change mean that the share of resources that women farmers can receive is already limited. Governments are skewing investments toward infrastructure projects, research institutions, private sector initiatives and more prosperous geographical areas. Climate change mitigation is prioritized over adaptation. Separately, international aid amounts are not matching expectations. Resources are geared toward other priorities such as infrastructure, there is limited transparency in spending in some countries, and coordination and operational challenges are the norm.

Despite the rhetoric given to international commitments, little action has been taken to ensure that women farmers have the resources they need to improve their livelihoods, tackle food insecurity and build their communities’ resilience to climate change. Governments are not effectively working to address social, cultural, economic and institutional barriers that prevent women farmers from accessing critical farming inputs. Indeed, women are largely excluded in governmental planning, budgeting, data collection and monitoring processes at all levels.

Genuine support to women farmers could unleash the potential of hundreds of millions to effectively reduce poverty and hunger, while building countries’ resilience to climate change. To achieve this,

Governments should support women farmers by:

• **Allocating resources specifically to women farmers**
  Rather than assuming that resources trickle down to women, budgeting for agriculture and climate change adaptation should incorporate specific line items to support women farmers.

• **Disaggregating data by gender**
  Gender-disaggregated data should be collected throughout agriculture and climate change planning and implementation processes.

• **Breaking down gender-specific barriers**
  Agriculture ministries should target gender-based barriers that restrict women’s access to key farm inputs.

• **Supporting the participation of women farmers in local budget decision making**
  Women’s groups and farmer associations can be trained to monitor budgeting at the municipal and local levels, in order to better leverage funding.

Governments should redirect resources to small-scale farming by:

• **Balancing support across small-scale farming and existing investments**
  Governments should critically examine investments and redirect sufficient support to small-scale farmers.

• **Aligning funding to areas with high levels of poverty**
  Spending should respond to geographic areas in which small-scale farmers are facing extreme poverty, rather than leaning
disproportionately toward more agriculturally productive or prosperous areas in a manner that can exacerbate inequality.

• **Building transparency and accountability through financial tracking systems**
  Governments should establish, or strengthen, expenditure tracking systems and assign a single coordinating agency to serve as the clearinghouse for information on all financial flows coming into the country.

• **Improving coherence and reducing bureaucracy**
  In order to channel the limited funding available to small-scale farming, ministries and local governments should integrate climate change, agriculture and gender issues across planning and programming.

• **Providing resources to local governments**
  Local governments need adequate resources to facilitate effective participation of small-scale farmers in budgetary decision making, and should receive adequate support to set up dedicated budget lines for participatory processes.

Developed countries should take steps to target women and smallholder farmers by:

• **Directing funding to where it is most needed**
  Developed country governments should have explicitly clear budget lines for small-scale producers, direct aid to countries and regions where it is most needed, and provide long-term funding for climate change adaptation to help diversify farmers’ livelihoods.

• **Improving reporting on international aid**
  Developed countries should post complete project data and documentation with clear coding in online databases, and monitor gender-related investments through budget tagging.
When the Nigerian government provided seeds, water pumps, fertilizer and loans to farmers as part of a national agriculture programme,5 only a few women were among the many beneficiaries. Following the death of her husband, Safiya Marafa was farming land in a community where women do not usually inherit property or participate in decision making. She did not have access to weather information, but followed the advice of extension workers to practice crop rotation and secured critical resources from the agricultural program. Safiya repaid her loan ahead of all the other farmers and doubled the amount of land she cultivated. As a result of the government’s services, Safiya’s family’s nutrition improved significantly. In exchange for labour, she provided food to other women farmers who were not able to access land and government support. Her story demonstrates how support directed to women farmers can lead to positive ripple effects across households, communities and countries.6

Farmers like Safiya play a central role in reversing poverty and food insecurity, and building resilience in the face of climate change. This contribution begins with the sheer number of women engaged in cultivating food for households and markets—around 43 percent of agricultural labour in developing countries.7 In eastern Africa, over half of farmers are women;8 in South Asia, more than two thirds of employed women work in agriculture.9 Women smallholder producers are heavily engaged in domestic activities, which remain hidden economically.10 These dual roles in households and on farms mean that their empowerment can have a wider impact on communities and economies.

Agriculture is more likely than other sectors to provide diverse opportunities for empowering women and reducing climate vulnerability.11 However, women do not receive the same support as men farmers, who have more access to farming inputs such as land, fertilizer and technology; financial services such as loans and subsidies; and technical support such as weather information and training through extension services. These barriers result in women producing 20–30 percent less than men; equalizing this gap has been projected to boost agricultural output and decrease global hunger by 17 percent.12 This potential boost to agricultural production, implemented in parallel to women’s rights objectives, could be transformative for smallholder farmers while tackling gender inequality.

Supporting women farmers is not simply about securing identical inputs for women and men, but ensuring that resources are in line with women’s needs. Social norms and institutional constraints are significant barriers to many resources being effective for women.13 Building the capacity of women farmers to become more self-sustaining is also critical.
Women farmers face restrictions related to their gender while also experiencing the financial struggles shared by all small-scale farmers. About 80 percent of the world’s food is produced by family farms, and small-scale farming is the dominant livelihood in most developing countries. Growth in small-scale agriculture is two to four times more effective at reducing hunger and poverty than any other sector. Yet limitations in resources, services and market opportunities prevent many small-scale farmers from feeding their families and reinvesting in their livelihoods.

Climate change brings an additional layer of vulnerability for small-scale farmers, whose dependence on rain-fed and marginal lands puts them on the front line of managing extreme weather fluctuations, despite not being responsible for the global problem. Climate change affects farming through variations in temperature and rainfall; extreme events such as flooding, drought, and heat waves; and changes in pests and diseases. Women farmers face greater exposure to climate risks due to the same barriers that reduce their productivity, such as limited access to land, information and mobility. Often, the resources that women are able to secure are more sensitive to climate hazards.

In response to the needs of women and small-scale farmers, and in recognition of the central role they play in food security:

• At the 2003 African Union Summit in Maputo, governments committed to dedicating 10 percent of their national budgets to agricultural development and eliminating gender discrimination in access to economic resources such as credit, training, extension services, land, information and technology.

• Agenda 2063 of the African Union Commission, established in 2010, calls for women to access at least 30 percent of agricultural financing.

• Governments committed to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) to achieve gender equality (SDG 5), end hunger (SDG 2), and combat the impacts of climate change (SDG 13).

• As part of the 2015 Paris Climate Accord, developed countries recommitted to mobilizing $100bn per year for adaptation and mitigation action in developing countries, and balancing adaptation and mitigation finance.

• Looking forward, more than 90 percent of developing countries’ Intended Nationally Determined Contributions identified the agriculture sector as a priority for adaptation.

• At the 2009 G8 summit in L’Aquila and at subsequent sessions in 2015 and 2016, donor countries committed to increasing agricultural aid. Developed country governments committed to spending 0.7 percent of GDP on international aid as part of a UN resolution in 1970.

• The European Union adopted a strong Food Security Policy Framework in 2010.
Oxfam’s researched the extent to which the commitments related to public domestic and international investment in agriculture and climate change adaptation are being met in Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines and Tanzania.26 While each country’s circumstances are unique, as a whole:

• they are not meeting their finance commitments;
• there is little evidence of money reaching women farmers;
• resources are being diverted to priorities besides smallholder farmers; and
• governments lack the capacity to deliver funding to smallholder farmers.

These findings are explored in detail in this briefing paper, followed by recommendations for governments and donors to integrate and implement as a part of their commitments to addressing poverty and gender inequality.
2  FUNDING GAPS IN AGRICULTURE AND CLIMATE ADAPTATION

To end hunger by 2030, about $267bn of additional public and private resources are needed per year to invest in social protection and productive activities that prioritize the poor.27 To adapt to climate change, developing countries could face costs of $140–300bn per year by 2030, a significant portion of which relates to agriculture.28 With some exceptions, countries are not keeping up with these financial needs, which may translate into a smaller proportion of funding available for women and smallholder farmers. Summarized below are Oxfam’s findings on government spending on agriculture and climate change adaptation, as well as international aid channelled to these sectors.

SPENDING ON AGRICULTURE

When the Maputo Declaration was established in 2003, Ethiopia was one of the few countries already allocating over 10 percent of its national budget to agriculture.29 The country has continued meeting the target, with federal spending on agriculture and rural development increasing by 62 percent in 2011–14.30 At the subnational level, where individual farmers are theoretically more likely to benefit directly, Ethiopia also increased spending on agriculture in Tigray, Amhara and Oromia—regions that are large in both area and population—by about 36 percent per year in 2010–13.31

Ghana’s spending on agriculture came very close to reaching the Maputo target in 2010. However, the country’s average spending in 2010–15 made up only 5.5 percent of the national budget.32

Nigeria’s spending on agriculture has remained significantly below the Maputo target of 10 percent. On average, its government allocated just 1.9 percent of its annual budget to agriculture in 2010–15, with a low of 0.9 percent in 2015.33

Tanzania’s spending on agriculture increased every year between 2003 and 2013, before declining.34 In the period 2007–17, agriculture received an average of 2.2 percent of the national budget.35
INTERNATIONAL AID FOR AGRICULTURE

International donors play an important role in governments’ ability to invest in agriculture. The share of agriculture and rural development in international aid varies across countries (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Average share of agriculture and rural development in international aid disbursements, 2007–15


International aid to Ghana for agriculture has increased over time. In 2006, it received only 1 percent of Ghana’s international aid; by 2010–14, this had increased to around a fifth. In 2011–12, about 87 percent of Ghana’s agricultural spending was donor-funded.

In Nigeria, international aid for agriculture declined significantly in 2012 and 2013, but then increased by a factor of five in 2015. The country’s agriculture and water budgets each received about 1 percent of aid in 2014–15, significantly behind that invested in health (68 percent) and education (19 percent). Among the countries studied, Nigeria’s spending on agriculture and rural development was the lowest share of its international aid (4.9 percent) in 2007–15.
SPENDING ON CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION

To adapt to climate change, developing countries could face costs of $140–300bn per year by 2030. Rich countries have committed to rapidly increase their climate change finance contributions to $100bn per year from 2020. The amounts delivered are a far cry from what was promised. Adaptation finance spending continues at only a fraction of the target amount, and total allocation for adaptation continues to be less than half of total climate finance. For existing climate adaptation funding, only a very small percentage is earmarked for smallholders: as of 2016, $345m in multilateral adaptation funding for smallholder agriculture had been approved. Notably, some $300m of multilateral adaptation funding has been pledged to one specific fund: IFAD’s Adaptation for Smallholders in Agriculture Program.

In the period 2011–14, the Philippines experienced a decrease in both the amount of international climate change funding and the proportion of this funding that went to adaptation. Adaptation surpassed mitigation in only one of these four years. On average, only 8 percent of this funding was in the forms of grants rather than loans, with a low of 0.12 percent in 2013. Moreover, an analysis of more than a dozen of the primary multilateral funds for climate finance identified only one single project—valued at approximately $1m—earmarked specifically for agricultural adaptation in the country. Given that international finance is primarily geared towards mitigation, the government is forced to invest its domestic budget on adaptation, therefore spending more than 90 percent of its national climate change budget on adaptation. Public finance for adaptation is essential, as it can be difficult to attract private investment, particularly to support marginalized groups. Thus, the government can find itself facing difficult choices between delivering basic public services and adapting to climate change.

Pakistan received $1.17bn in multilateral flows for climate change in 2014, but only 26 percent of this was designated for climate change adaptation. Almost 99 percent of the funding was in the form of loans, with grant funding for climate change adaptation amounting to only $3.4m. Pakistan allocated just $385,000 to its national climate change division in 2015–16, the majority of which was spent on a single activity in the food and agriculture sector. In Punjab, the provincial government projected spending 26 percent of its total agricultural budget on climate change in 2015–17. Across twenty multilateral funds supporting climate change, only one project in Pakistan was related to agriculture.

While overall finance for climate change adaptation is very limited, Ghana managed to use almost half of this funding to support the agricultural sector. Multilateral climate funding to Ghana included a $10m project under the Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme (ASAP), as well as projects on agroforestry and water management. Although 10 percent of the money in the government’s climate change plan for 2010–15 was targeted toward climate-resilient
agriculture and food security, only 67 percent of what was allocated ended up being spent by the Ministry of Agriculture.\textsuperscript{58}

Nigeria has received a paltry amount of funding for climate change adaptation. As of May 2017, only $15m has arrived from multilateral institutions.\textsuperscript{59} Of this, only one project valued at $1.8m is clearly earmarked for agriculture.\textsuperscript{60} Nigeria’s population is about equal to the combined populations of the six countries receiving the largest share of multilateral climate adaptation funding—Niger, Tanzania, Mozambique, Zambia, Mali and Uganda.\textsuperscript{61} However, these countries combined have received 47 times as much multilateral finance for adaptation as Nigeria.\textsuperscript{62}
3 LITTLE EVIDENCE OF BUDGET REACHING WOMEN FARMERS

Oxfam has found little evidence that women farmers are receiving investments for agriculture and climate change adaptation, or that their interests are reflected in government budgets. However, governments are failing to capture gender-specific data, so it is not possible to confirm what allocations, if any, are being made to benefit women farmers.

There is little demonstration that women farmers are targeted in resource distribution. The prevailing assumption is that, if resources are flowing to smallholder farmers, women farmers will automatically be among the beneficiaries. Even where there is a policy pledge to address gender issues, for example in agricultural and environmental ministries, governments are not requiring these bodies to incorporate a gender-specific budget line. In the few examples where resources are assigned, they are often drawn from recurrent budgets, and thus limited to departmental operations. Internationally, donors have begun to tag gender-related spending, which is a positive trend that could be expanded.

Reaching women farmers requires removing the barriers they face in access to essential agricultural inputs such as land, machinery and loans. To improve women’s access to credit, support is needed in securing women’s equal land rights through legally recognized documentation. Ensuring that women farmers receive equal access to technical support may require reforming extension services to ensure their needs are met, such as gender sensitivity training for extension workers. The lack of evidence of investment in removing these types of barriers suggests that governments are not responding to the needs of women farmers.63

ETHIOPIA

In Ethiopia, limited use of gender-specific indicators and data collection is a major impediment. The country’s 2010–15 economic development plan64 emphasized women’s empowerment; however, the plan had only one gender-related target for agriculture—the number of women and men using extension services. It did not allocate adequate resources to implement its gender-related commitments. Ethiopia’s agricultural policy,65 designed to fulfil the country’s commitment to the Maputo target, has been criticised for being ‘gender-blind’ and does not include any strategies for ensuring agricultural investments are gender-responsive. While the policy includes a footnote recommending that indicators be sex-disaggregated, this has not been implemented in any of the policy’s targets or indicators.66
Under-resourcing of the Ethiopian government’s gender mechanisms is another challenge. The 1994 national women’s policy envisions capacity for women’s affairs to be present at all levels of government, from the prime minister’s office to village-level offices. However, the policy did not assign financial and human resources for implementation, and the directorate of women affairs remains the government’s most understaffed body. The agriculture ministry, which does not have a budget line focusing on women, follows the assumption that gender issues will be mainstreamed in other parts of the budget despite a lack of targets. Box 1 outlines an attempt by the Ethiopian government to respond to women farmers in a national agricultural programme.

Box 1: Responding to women farmers in Ethiopia’s Agricultural Growth Program

The Ethiopian government’s Agricultural Growth Program attempted to address the needs of women farmers. It set a 30 percent target at the outset for women’s involvement; however, the budget did not specify how funds were to be allocated to women’s participation, or how to measure whether farmers or women have participated. In one component, only 20 percent of participants were women; in a survey of farmers involved in the programme, only five out of 67 respondents were women. Between 7–20 percent of households benefiting were headed by women. The programme also intended to track results with sex-disaggregated indicators, but qualitative indicators providing information about impacts on women’s lives were missing, and the resulting data was not used to adjust federal-, regional- or district-level plans.

Some women farmers did reap benefits. Through access to irrigation, they increased crop production and improved household nutrition. Other women improved their family’s livelihoods through increased income and more direct engagement in markets without relying on brokers. These successes were attributed to close follow-up by technical experts, and women selecting their own locally demanded agribusiness.

The programme made some missteps. District governments compiled best practice documents that subscribed stereotypical roles to women farmers, restricting their ability to adopt new practices. And as part of a research system, women farmers did not have easy access to improved crop varieties and animal breeds. One of the challenges was limited gender expertise in the government and the programme’s implementing agencies.


GHANA

In Ghana, one of the agriculture ministry’s eight technical bodies is a directorate devoted to women. The directorate is tasked with developing policies and programmes; improving extension services to support women farmers; and undertaking research and training in response to women’s challenges. However, the directorate remains severely
underfunded, as it is allocated an average of just 0.05 percent of the agricultural budget in 2010–15. This lack of funding has left Ghana’s national strategy on gender and agriculture unimplemented since it was created in the late 1990s. A similar lack of funding was identified for climate change, with Ghana’s women’s ministry being allocated less than 1 percent and receiving only 0.1 percent of climate change funding in 2010–15. Investment in the country’s northern savannah zone would benefit a population that constitutes half of the country’s extreme poor including a large number of female-headed households, however only 1.3 percent of the budget was spent on this region in 2010–15.

Ghana’s plans for economic transformation include gender-disaggregated targets such as:

- productivity differences between women and men farmers;
- use of extension services and inputs;
- livestock production;
- food security; and
- job creation.

However, gender-disaggregated data is not available from the national statistics agency, women’s ministry, the agriculture ministry, nor the country’s financial tracking system. At the district level, government bodies use monitoring tools to track women’s participation in training sessions, but there is no measurement of technology use or productivity, and benefits are assumed to accrue to both women and men. The budgeting process does not require departments to consider gender in their proposals nor to monitor progress on gender-related results, but federal departments are expected to report gender outcomes in final results. To address donor interests, there can be significant ‘lip service’ given to gender issues, as well as the production of documents and manuals on the topic, while gender inequalities remain unchanged on the ground.

PAKISTAN

In Pakistan, while the government has broadly acknowledged the importance of women’s roles, there is a significant gap in budget, staff and expertise to implement such priorities. Budget and planning documents do not show any investments directly supporting small-scale women producers. In the province of Punjab, only two out of eleven projects under the umbrella of women’s empowerment included a climate change component in 2015–17. The country’s draft agriculture and food security policy emphasizes the role of women, small-scale producers and landless agricultural workers. It also seeks to improve access to technology, inputs, infrastructure and finance for these marginalized groups. However, it remains in draft form—the food security ministry has been functioning without a policy since 2011.
NIGERIA

In Nigeria, policy guidance on adaptation in the agricultural sector included one recommendation on gender, but this was limited to encouraging women’s participation in livelihood development initiatives. While women’s participation is important, this is a low bar that is unlikely to change much for women farmers. A more significant response to women’s needs can be found in the national agricultural resilience framework, which promotes ownership of motorized pumps by women farmers to improve water management, as well as the provision of cash transfers and nutritional interventions to support women and children. However, implementation of these aspects is not sufficiently monitored.79

INTERNATIONAL DONORS

The EU through its development policy has played a key role in signalling the importance of closing the gender gap in agriculture. While the EU has committed to investing in women farmers, in practice they are not the primary targets of agricultural aid. In an Oxfam study of over 7,500 EU-funded agriculture development projects between 2007 and 2015 that spanned the globe, funding targeted at gender equality as a ‘principal’ objective comprised only 0.6 percent of all EU aid for agriculture. In sub-Saharan Africa, the proportion of funding for enhancing gender equality was even lower. Similarly, in the evaluations of 25 EU-funded projects, gender equality was found to be a ‘principal’ objective in only one project. While gender equality was noted as a ‘significant’ objective in 19 projects, few of those projects included actions that specifically targeted women (see Figure 2).80

Figure 2: EU aid for agriculture in support of gender equality (Euro, m)81
4 RESOURCES DIVERTED TO OTHER PRIORITIES

Funding for agriculture and climate change adaptation that does reach these countries is often directed to infrastructure and capital projects, research institutions, the value chains of individual crops and geographic areas that suffer less from endemic poverty. These types of investments, which are more visible to the public and provide support to established institutions, may end up having an indirect impact on the livelihoods of smallholder farmers. However, the disproportionate spending in these areas is eclipsing direct support to the majority of smallholder farmers who are not engaged in cash crops. Given that there are numerous pathways out of poverty, there is a need to rebalance these investment priorities.

GHANA

In Ghana, investment is not balanced across the subsectors or areas in which the highest concentration of impoverished smallholder farmers operates. In 2010–15, the cocoa sector received an average allocation of almost half of the government’s agricultural budget. Cocoa is grown by many smallholder farmers and is a major source of export earnings for the country, making sustained support of the crop an import area investment for the country. The crops and livestock sectors, in which most of the agricultural labour force and poor smallholder farmers are active, received an average of one quarter of the government budget over the same period (see Figure 3). The cocoa growing areas are in the less poor southern region of the country, while staple crops and livestock are produced in the northern region where poverty tends to be more concentrated. Similarly, urban agricultural activities in urban areas are prioritized: while the capital area of Accra accounts for only 5.6 percent of Ghana’s population living in poverty, it receives 18 percent of the government’s agricultural funding.
Figure 3: Breakdown of Ghana’s Agricultural Budget 2010–15

Source: Annual Public Accounts (2010-2015) from Controller and Accountant General Department (CAGD); Ghana Cocoa Board (COCOBOD). Referenced in Addo (2016). Table 7. WIAD is one of the 8 technical directorates of MoFA. The other directorates are: Agricultural Engineering Services, Agricultural Extension Services, Animal Production, Crop Services, Fisheries, Plant Protection and Regulatory Services, and Veterinary Services.

Funding in Ghana also tilts toward capital expenditure. Therefore, spending is limited on goods and services, both of which could benefit smallholder farmers through subsidies. In 2015 the amount allocated to major infrastructure projects such as agricultural mechanization, irrigation and dams was five times more than other categories. Although farmers may benefit from infrastructure improvements, small-scale farmers and women also need access to extension agents, local market access and other support services.

THE PHILIPPINES

In the Philippines, adaptation funding is often given in the form of large infrastructure loans to the public works and energy departments, with agricultural investment and community-level adaptation not receiving the grants needed. Public works received 88 percent of adaptation finance in 2017, while agriculture received just six percent. Infrastructure is an important aspect of climate change adaptation, especially in a country such as the Philippines that experiences such extreme weather events, but this extreme imbalance is leaving smallholder farmers without the support they need. As an example of municipal-level funding, 60 percent of the government of Tanauan’s climate change budget is allocated to infrastructure investments; agriculture has the lowest allocation in the
municipality’s local adaptation plan. Farmers have communicated their needs, but funding is insufficient to cover both infrastructure investments and the priorities voiced by farmers.

While infrastructure projects are prioritized, climate change adaptation plans throughout the Philippines remain largely unfunded. For example, the municipal government of San Francisco on Camotes Island was the first to conduct a vulnerability assessment, identify adaptation options and submit a local plan for funding to the national People’s Survival Fund, which was created to support vulnerable communities to adapt to climate change. Already unable to grow enough food to meet local needs, several times per year typhoons cut off the island from food and medical supplies, while flooding increases the incidence of dengue and diarrhoea. On average (in 2010–15) only 5 percent of the municipality’s budget is allocated to climate change, and only 3 percent to agriculture, leaving any additional needs reliant on external sources. However, the municipality has yet to receive any funding based on their plan.

**NIGERIA**

In Nigeria, interventions that could transform the lives of farmers are being passed over in favour of large infrastructure projects and research initiatives. Half of agricultural funding goes toward capital projects—a significant proportion of this goes to around 40 training and research institutions. Capital funding and research targeted at irrigation and crop development could potentially have an effect on the lives of small-scale and women farmers, but governments need to ensure that research findings are translated into actions that have an impact on their lives. Funding is also skewed away from areas with higher incidences of poverty. The southwest of Nigeria received 15 times as much aid disbursements as the northeast, which ranks lower on human development indices.

In some cases, funding that would be better spent to directly benefit small-scale farmers ends up in capital projects that collapse before completion. One typical example is Nigeria’s Chouchi Irrigation Project in the state of Adamawa, which was intended to divert river water to a pumping station for farmers. After being abandoned due to contracting problems, villagers began to develop structures on the land that jeopardized the continuation of the project. Governments and donors should pay careful attention to resources invested in large-scale projects that may not end up benefiting farmers.
TANZANIA

In Tanzania, there is evidence that farmers are missing key resources such as seeds, information alerts relevant to farming, training in farming techniques, market accessibility and loans (see Box 2).^91

Box 2: Government support needed by Tanzania’s farmers

An Oxfam survey of 3,000 farmers across 13 regions of Tanzania identified the support that farmers need from their government, with the majority requesting subsidies for farming inputs, and one quarter requesting that the government provide training from experts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support needed from government</th>
<th>Percentage of farmers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies for farming inputs</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training from experts</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market access</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of counterfeit farming inputs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate areas for animal feeding and crop production</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tanzania survey also revealed that the majority of farmers are not benefitting from extension services. When they do receive services, most farmers describe the quality as ‘average’ or ‘poor’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extension services</th>
<th>Percentage of farmers not receiving services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality seeds</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil conservation</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice to women groups</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation skills</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terracing</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop diversification</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessing startup capital</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather condition information</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silo crop storage and animal shelters</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 INADEQUATE CAPACITY TO DELIVER FUNDING

Oxfam found that all of the governments analysed lack adequate financial tracking systems. This makes it difficult to check progress towards national plans and international commitments. Some governments have no mechanism to track and publish spending on agriculture and climate change adaptation, while others lack tracking systems capable of showing whether spending reaches small-scale farmers or has an impact on their lives. Some of the countries’ agricultural budgets are lumped together with spending in other areas such as mining, environment or trade.92 Governments categorize a broad range of actions under the guise of climate change adaptation, which may misrepresent the amount of funding channelled to adaptation. Further, donors do not always channel or report funding through governments’ centralized systems, which can cause inconsistencies between national and international information and undermine national efforts. While global and national frameworks for climate adaptation financing are new, the existing weaknesses of tracking systems will impede the delivery of finance going forward.

Government departments also face other challenges in targeting resources to smallholder and women farmers, including planning and coordination, participatory decision making, efficient disbursements and corruption. Policies on agriculture, climate change and gender are often not coordinated across ministries. Local government departments are not well resourced, and may not be afforded the capacity by national governments or donors to facilitate consultations to ensure the needs of farmers are reflected in spending. Lengthy bureaucratic processes often slow down delivery, which can result in inputs arriving too late for the planting or harvesting seasons.

PAKISTAN

Approved in 2012, Pakistan’s climate change policy addresses both adaptation and mitigation measures across a range of sectors including agriculture and livestock. However, its fulfilment has been slowed by a lack of implementation planning, strategies to access funding and capacity at lower levels of government. As with other decision-making processes in Pakistan, climate change planning is dominated by technical experts and officials, which can exclude the voices of other stakeholders.93 Coordination across governmental bodies has also been an obstacle, for example with the country’s disaster risk management and poverty reduction strategies. A major challenge in assessing climate change spending across sectors in Pakistan is the lack of public data available on government budgets in this area.
Further, there is little inclusiveness or transparency in local-level planning—in a 2015 study, Pakistan scored only 10 out of 100 points for public engagement in the government’s budgeting process. However, Oxfam has supported districts in the province of Punjab to create ‘local adaptation plans of action’, bringing community officials into local vulnerability assessments and resulting in increased budget allocations at the district level (see Box 3).

Box 3: Bringing the voices of farmers into Pakistan’s provincial climate change plans

In 2015, the Lahore High Court heard a case brought by a farmer, Asghar Leghari, against the provincial government of Punjab. Leghari argued that the government had not taken steps to develop the required resilience to climate change as set out in the 2012 National Climate Policy and Framework. In his judgment, the court noted that climate change ‘appears to be the most serious threat faced by Pakistan’ and ordered the establishment of a Climate Change Commission to monitor the Framework’s implementation.

Oxfam’s GROW campaign and its national partner LEAD worked with the Punjab government to formulate a provincial climate change policy in line with its national counterpart. The initiative brought the voices of rural communities to the Climate Change Commission, and the priorities of diverse stakeholders were taken up in the provincial policy. Future plans include creating a body within the national planning and development department that would handle provincial climate change policies, align annual development schemes with climate change policy and the UN Sustainable Development Goals, and establish provincial green funds to finance climate and development projects.

Challenges remain in accessing global climate funding at the local level in order to conduct vulnerability assessments, make local plans accountable to the needs of women and to make sure national reports are informed by provincial needs and vulnerabilities.

THE PHILIPPINES

In an effort to increase accountability and transparency, the government of the Philippines recently established the Climate Change Expenditure Tracking system. It is intended to show which priorities are being funded by whom, and to help the government hold international donors to their commitments. While a positive first step, it requires some improvements. First, national agencies and local governments are in charge of identifying investments that can be considered adaptation or mitigation, and a number of questionable projects related to volcanoes and earthquakes have been tagged. Second, simple budget tagging cannot demonstrate whether resources are reaching marginalized groups. A more comprehensive system would assess whether climate change investments are meeting their intended objectives, and could be used to attract additional international resources for adaptation, particularly at the local level.
GHANA

Ghana’s planning and budgeting system reflects principles of good governance on paper. The government regularly publishes a simplified version of the budget in local languages. Stakeholder consultations are intended to inform decision-making. However, participation by marginalized groups is limited, and the consultations are poorly resourced at the local level—women farmers are hardly consulted and their needs are not regularly reflected in projects. Another challenge is the gap between the money allocated versus the amounts that are eventually made available. Of the $86.7m approved in multilateral climate change financing as of 2016, only about 37 percent has been disbursed by international donors, which takes a toll on the capacity of the government to tackle climate change.

NIGERIA

Nigeria’s government has had trouble channelling funding through a centralized system. While the planning commission established the Development Assistance Database to monitor incoming finance from donors, not all donors channel their interventions through it. The lack of consistent financial information is also apparent through discrepancies between this national tracking system and international platforms. About 400 projects are currently recorded in Nigeria’s national database, as opposed to about 1,800 active projects reported in the International Aid Transparency Initiative’s tracking system. Such a gap impedes assessment of the effectiveness of spending and attracting additional investment.
6 RECOMMENDATIONS

Genuine support to women farmers could unleash the potential of hundreds of millions to effectively reduce poverty and hunger, while building countries’ resilience to climate change. Governments have been negligent in attaining their commitments. They must break down the barriers that are holding back women farmers while simultaneously redirecting resources to strengthen small-scale farming. The following recommendations are geared towards the developing and middle-income countries that were part of Oxfam’s study, but are likely relevant to others. An additional set of recommendations below is directed toward developed country governments.

Governments should take steps to support women farmers

• Allocate resources specifically to women farmers
  Rather than assuming that resources trickle down to women, budgeting for agriculture and climate change adaptation should incorporate specific line items to support women farmers. Government departments—including but not limited to ministries of agriculture, women, environment and finance—should reserve a proportion of capital budget for actions that put farming resources and support directly into the hands of women farmers.

• Disaggregate data by gender
  Gender-disaggregated data should be collected throughout agriculture and climate change planning and implementation processes. They should also be integrated into national statistics databases and monitoring systems. Such data should not be limited to women’s participation, but instead capture outcomes in the lives of women farmers, and identify specific allocations and expenditures dedicated to these outcomes.

• Break down gender-specific barriers
  Agriculture ministries should target gender-based barriers that restrict women’s access to key farm inputs. This includes identifying pathways for women to access credit and finance without legal land tenure, or to receive timely information about market access or irrigation. Governments should increase the number and reach of extension workers who are sensitized to the needs of women farmers.

• Support the participation of women farmers in local budget decision making
  Women’s groups and farmer associations can be trained to monitor budgeting at the municipal and local levels, in order to better leverage funding. Given barriers to equal participation in farmers’ associations, local governments should explore avenues for increasing women’s participation and leadership in these bodies.
Governments should take steps to redirect resources to small-scale farming

• **Balance support across small-scale farming and existing investments**
  Governments should critically examine the dominance of investments in infrastructure, private sector projects and research institutions. They should redirect sufficient support to small-scale farmers, for example irrigation, seed and fertilizer, extension services, access to credit and mechanization. Governments should provide inputs that are environmentally sustainable and climate resilient, for example drought-tolerant seeds and organic fertilizer, and invest in seed banks and other mechanisms that reduce the need for farmers to receive subsidies. Support should also be directed to capacity-building and technical advice to help farmers become self-sufficient. Laws should be in place to cap recurrent expenditure such as government operations and policy development in order to avoid favouring that kind of spending over delivering farm inputs. Budgets should evenly support compensation, goods and services, and capital expenditure. To ensure adequate funding, governments should employ domestic resource mobilization through pro-poor and effective tax systems.

• **Align funding with high poverty incidence**
  Spending should respond to geographic areas in which small-scale farmers are facing extreme poverty, rather than leaning disproportionately toward more agriculturally productive or prosperous areas in a manner that can exacerbate inequality. Farms in more prosperous areas. Local and regional agricultural budgets should be assigned based on rates of poverty, female-headed households, vulnerability to climate change and number of smallholders. In addition to supporting small investor farmers, governments should support subsistence farmers that are positioned to make a jump to markets.

• **Build transparency and accountability through financial tracking systems**
  Governments should establish, or strengthen, expenditure tracking systems and assign a single coordinating agency to serve as the clearinghouse for information on all financial flows coming into the country. This may help curb duplication and illicit finance. To ensure consistency and prevent duplication in budget tracking, internationally accepted definitions, criteria and budget codes should be used for small-scale agriculture and climate change adaptation.102

• **Improve coherence and reduce bureaucracy**
  In order to channel the limited funding available to small-scale farming, ministries and local governments should integrate climate change, agriculture and gender issues across planning and programming. Government procurement and financial processes should be streamlined to ensure timely distribution of funding and better disbursement of allocations.

• **Provide resources to local governments**
  Local governments need adequate resources to facilitate effective participation of small-scale farmers in budgetary decision making, and
should receive adequate support to set up dedicated budget lines for participatory processes. National governments should consider setting a target for local financing in their portfolio. Local climate adaptation plans, developed with the input of those most vulnerable to climate change, must receive the funding needed.

Developed countries should take steps to target women and smallholder farmers

• Direct funding to where it is most needed
  Developed countries should meet their climate finance obligations, which should be new and additional financing on top of ODA. Developed country governments should have explicitly clear budget lines for small-scale producers, direct aid to countries and regions where it is most needed, and provide long-term funding for climate change adaptation to help diversify farmers’ livelihoods. IFAD’s Adaptation for Smallholders in Agriculture Program is one of several funds already set up to channel these resources.

• Improve reporting on international aid
  Developed countries should post complete project data and documentation with clear coding in online databases.\textsuperscript{103} Gender tagging should be expanded, drawing on the OECD gender policy marker system.\textsuperscript{104}
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