

## MODULE 1 - BACKGROUND NOTE

This document provides basic information about land degradation in Sub-Saharan Africa, its consequences and the conditions which have led to the current disastrous situation. It also presents the modern approach to Sustainable Land Management, why it needs to be scaled up in the region and the many obstacles faced in doing it.

Land degradation in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) is a major challenge that cuts across issues of poverty, health, the environment and economic growth. Without an integrated approach to the challenge, current rates of land degradation cannot be reversed nor can the region's socio-economic development targets be met. Sustainable Land Management (SLM) offers the integrated approach needed to provide cross cutting solutions to the challenge. Although results to date have not met expectations, there is a growing awareness of the barriers and bottlenecks to achieving success that had not formed an integral part of earlier solution packages.

With the levels of political awareness of the importance of SLM growing, the time is now right to scale up the response and mainstream SLM into the center of the development agendas of the nations of SSA and of their international partners. Business as usual will not produce the needed impact and only a new business model will be appropriate to the challenge. A new business model is proposed to be articulated

under TerrAfrica, which is discussed in the accompanying Strategy Note.

### The Challenge of Land Degradation in sub-Saharan Africa

The United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) recognizes that desertification -- the degradation of dry lands -- is complex and caused by a variety of factors that include both climate change and human activity. The most commonly cited forms of unsustainable land use are over-cultivation, overgrazing, deforestation and poor irrigation practices. Land degradation, while chiefly associated with dry lands, is not limited to them and can occur wherever the results of human activity or natural disaster lead to an area's biomass being converted to one of lower productivity.

Up to two-thirds of Africa's productive land area is affected by land degradation, while close to 100% is vulnerable to it. Although Africa hosts only 17% of the world's forests, the continent accounts for over half of all global deforestation, most of which is driven by demands for more agricultural land at a time when land degradation and/or poor land management continues to be a major challenge for SSA.<sup>1</sup> These increasing

<sup>1</sup> Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Desertification Synthesis Report (Draft for Review, 11 Nov 2004). The greatest net reduction of forest area between 1990 and 2000 occurred in SSA and was estimated at a loss of approximately 0.8% of the forest area per year. Loss of tropical dry forest in east

*This note is part of a set of five basic documents for TerrAfrica: a Background Note provides a description of challenges being faced to promote Sustainable Land Management in Sub-Saharan Africa and justifies the concept of TerrAfrica, a Strategy Note explains the nature of the partnership, how it works and how it cooperates with and complements existing initiatives; a Business Planning Framework lays out the detailed objectives and concrete steps to be taken to achieve TerrAfrica's vision; a Governance Note establishes the governance principles of TerrAfrica and the mechanisms to facilitate partners to interactions; and a Presentation Note for the TerrAfrica Leveraging Fund, the multi-donor trust fund set up to support the partnership and its activities. Each of the basic documents occasionally refers to the others, however, it is highly recommended to consult the whole set of document for a complete understanding of the TerrAfrica approach and its coherence with ongoing efforts. See Annex 4 for key to documents.*

demands for land, coupled with continuing land degradation and heightened competition for water, mean that two-thirds of Africa's cropland could effectively be non-productive by 2025. The economic costs of this poor land management have been estimated to be US\$9 billion per annum<sup>2</sup> and over 3% of agricultural GDP is lost annually as a direct result of soil and nutrient loss in SSA.<sup>3</sup>

Most evaluations of the costs of land degradation have focused on soil loss and the consequent reductions in nutrient levels and productivity. Assessments have generally not focused on the broader impacts of land degradation on rural communities, ecosystem services and agro-industries. As the drylands most often are where agriculture is usually most marginal and grazing seasonal, human populations are highly sensitive to reductions in productivity.

Up to 75% of Africa's poor still live in rural areas and the most vulnerable among them are often relegated to the most marginal lands. It is these lands whose productivity is most at risk and whose populations are most vulnerable. It is here that the links between environment, poverty and development are most pronounced. With such a high rural population, Africa's long-term food security and its prospects for sustained and equitable economic growth require that the challenge of land degradation be met through SLM strategies that address the socio-economic needs and aspirations of those who live and work the land.

Land degradation in SSA is a process with major implications on society and economy, health and the environment. Without the ability to invest in SLM, human populations produce less and degrade more. Their food security levels decline with consequent

increases in malnutrition and associated health risks. Ultimately, the process may result in human destitution and abandoned, unproductive land, and migration of population.

### **Contributing Factors**

---

The direct causes of land degradation are those that have been best documented and costed. These are activities that directly damage or remove the soil's protective cover and they range from forest clearance and conversion to overgrazing and erosion. These direct causes have been the result of much analytical research and the application of many technical solutions. Despite them all, land degradation has continued to accelerate.

The indirect causes, or contributing factors listed below, are often more difficult to identify and quantify in terms of their impacts on the way in which land is used and managed. But without a clear appreciation of them and the role they play, it is unlikely that the challenge of land degradation will ever be addressed and SLM mainstreamed to become a central pillar of the development agenda.

These contributing factors can be grouped under two headings:

1. Physical. These relate to activities which are not directly degrading but which may contribute to degradation in the medium to long term.
2. Policy and legislative. These most importantly include:
  - The links between land tenure and the ability to invest in improvements
  - The impact of taxation and other levies on the economic viability of dry land agriculture and range grazing.

---

and southern Africa, predominately in dry land regions, accounted for the majority of this decline.

<sup>2</sup> GTZ CCD Fact Sheet on Desertification (cite: Dregne 1991).

<sup>3</sup> Drechsel and Gyiele 1999.

- The role played by subsidized imports of agricultural commodities in distorting local markets.<sup>4</sup>
- The role of health and educational service provision in improving the capacity of land users to work the land and make informed choices.
- The impact of poorly functioning labor markets on cultivation practices.
- The fragmentation of information and knowledge systems resulting in sub-optimal information being made available to local extension and other government services.
- The lack of consensus between land users or managers and policy decision makers on appropriate land use practices.
- The impact of inadequate funding levels that have failed to rise to the challenge of land degradation.

### **The Sustainable Land Management Approach**

---

By working to address not just the physical manifestations of land degradation but also its root causes, SLM will provide the means by which the challenge of land degradation becomes a core component of development thinking in SSA. This is because "Sustainable Land Management combines technologies, policies, and activities aimed at integrating socio-economic principles with environmental concerns so as to simultaneously maintain or enhance production, reduce the level of production risk, protect the potential of natural resources and prevent (buffer against) soil and water degradation, be economically viable, and be socially acceptable."<sup>5</sup>

SLM, by offering a new and enhanced appreciation of the centrality of the role of land degradation as an obstacle to efforts to develop sustainable and equitable economic

growth, provides direct linkages to effective poverty reduction strategies.

An integrated SLM approach that works with all sectors that have an impact on land degradation will set new development priorities, generate new partnerships, improve and better coordinate research, establish and improve policy development frameworks, and catalyze sustainable flows of investment. SLM, while tackling old problems, brings a new approach to the challenge of land degradation.

What is new is the acknowledgement that people are as much the solution as the problem they have in the past been accused of being. SLM seeks to understand the context in which decisions are made at every level from the land user to the international institutions guiding credit and trade policies.

This acknowledgement leads directly to the need to mainstream SLM into the heart of SSA's development agenda. To do this, the root causes of land degradation and of the poverty traps that so many land users find themselves in must be researched and understood.

The policy implications of the results of such analyses need to be fed into local, national and international decision making processes. They must then form part of the central matrix that guides national and local economic development and investment strategies.

These are not issues that were traditionally central to responses to land degradation but which are today seen as critical components. Without a coherent and inclusive understanding of SLM, the needed resources to implement SLM as a central development strategy will not be made available. Achieving this understanding will support the achievement of NEPAD's land pillar under CAADP and UNCCD's objectives. In addition, without an understanding of the clear linkages between land degradation,

<sup>4</sup> Dirk Kloss, Michael Kirk, Max Kasparek. *World Bank Africa Region SLM Portfolio Review*, Draft 19 Jan 2004.

<sup>5</sup> Smyth and Dumanski, 1993

poverty, educational deprivation and HIV/AIDs and poor access to health services, competition for scarce financial resources will continue to undervalue the importance of land degradation.

### **The Case for Scaling-up SLM**

---

With agriculture providing employment for 66% of working Africans and generating a third of the continent's Gross National Income, land degradation in the countries of SSA that have large rural populations is clearly a genuine constraint to economic growth.<sup>6</sup> With 65% of the entire African population affected by desertification processes<sup>7</sup> and suffering socio-economic conditions that lag significantly behind those of people in other areas, it is inconceivable that national development targets can be met without addressing the needs of these people and the fragile environments in which they subsist.

It also reduces the likelihood of PRSPs achieving their targets by constraining opportunities for new investment and improvements in productivity. At the present time, the majority of international development investment is geared towards the MDG and PRSP processes without having given due recognition to the role of land degradation in effectively hindering the chances that the targets set under these programs can be achieved.

Conversely, well defined PRSPs and MDG implementation strategies will have positive effects on land degradation by improving the socio-economic conditions of the rural poor. These benefits cannot, however, be transformed into changes in land use or land management practices without an analytic approach which provides clear linkages to SLM.

By linking SLM closely to the PRSP and MDG processes, more effective targeting of resources can be made to those people, places and institutions whose actions or omissions have an impact on the land degradation process.

At the present time, there is no clear and coherent processes that bring together all of the diverse analyses, policies and investments that can drive the success stories. Nor is there a platform that allows researchers, policy makers, donors, practitioners and politicians to come together to review knowledge and current approaches, identify gaps, and harmonize and rationalize the allocation of resources.

Without an inclusive and participative process, both at regional and country levels, there will not be the context in which SLM and its financing can be scaled up and mainstreamed in a sufficiently coherent and consistent manner.

### **What Went Wrong ?**

---

The call from affected countries and stakeholders for more effective action significantly predates the Rio summit and the establishment of the UNCCD. However, despite the repeated calls for action, little substantive progress has been made at the regional level despite undoubted local successes along the way.

This is partly because the integrated understanding that is represented by the SLM approach was slow in emerging. Consequently, development policies and packages were often tightly focused both geographically and thematically, resulting in funding levels that failed to match the scale of the problem. Furthermore, these funds were rarely targeted at the full range of factors that underpin and exacerbate land degradation, and were not applied long enough to generate positive results. Land degradation therefore suffered from being pigeonholed as an agricultural or environmental problem rather than being seen and understood as a cross cutting issue

<sup>6</sup> Reij. C. and Steeds .C. 2003. Success stories in Africa's drylands: supporting advocates and answering skeptics. Global Mechanism of the UNCCD. And Ryden. P. 2005. Stocktaking for TerrAfrica. Draft for discussion.

<sup>7</sup> Reich et al. 2001.

and thus SLM has also likewise been pigeonholed and diminished as a potential solution.

Lessons drawn from past experience point to the need to:<sup>8</sup>

- Increase the poverty focus of SLM investments.
- Focus much more clearly on the root causes of land degradation rather than its symptoms.
- Expand the understanding of land degradation within the context of the UNCCD NAP process.
- Improve the documentation and analysis of successes and failures.
- Give more importance to the role of enabling policy, legislation and institutional conditions (“SLM governance”).
- Improve both the level and targeting of domestic and international funding.
- Improve the levels of commitment and political will from governments and donor agencies.
- Improve the delivery mechanisms for financial and technical support.
- Recognize that successful returns on investment under a comprehensive SLM approach will take more time than is usually available in the traditional project cycle.

The result has been that most analyses have failed to look deeply enough at prevailing socio-economic conditions and then to go on and link them to the wider economic and political environment. Without such a linked analytical framework, it has proved difficult to mobilize either sufficient funds or the political commitments necessary to guarantee the effective delivery of SLM. Recent studies in the highlands of Ethiopia have demonstrated some of the important links between poverty and destitution and a

number of other factors which are often overlooked or undervalued<sup>9</sup>.

Some of these are:

- The existence of tenancy arrangements that support productive investment.
- The availability of labor to support those without adequate levels of family labor and work on the land to provide cash incomes.
- The availability of markets and access to them in order to facilitate the exchange of goods and the establishment of services.

The ability of people to take advantage of these key factors was closely correlated to their health and educational levels. The findings clearly demonstrate the requirement to see land management as a cross cutting issue. These findings are not just limited to Africa as similar ones have been recorded across Latin America.<sup>10</sup> When the points above are not achievable, the viability of smallholder farming is severely impaired leading to increased poverty, destitution, migration and land degradation.

### **Time for Action**

---

With a new and deepened appreciation of the broad based socio-economic and bio-physical impacts of land degradation, the time has come to create a regional action-oriented platform from which to proactively support implementation of existing frameworks such as NEPAD’s CAADP and the UNCCD. For them to achieve their potential, it is also necessary to build a new consensus in order to generate an African led coalition that can coordinate, consolidate and build the strengthened awareness necessary to leverage sufficient financial

---

<sup>8</sup> The Global Mechanism (GM) has carried out a review of lessons learned regarding the implementation of the UNCCD.

---

<sup>9</sup> Destitution in Ethiopia’s North Eastern Highlands (Amhara National Regional State). Final Report. Kay Sharp, Stephen Devereux, Yared Amare. Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, UK and SCF-UK Ethiopia. April 2003.

<sup>10</sup> See for example: The Social Causes of Environmental Destruction in Latin America. Eds: Michael Painter and William Durham. University of Michigan Press. 1995.



and non-financial resources both at domestic and international levels to scale up and mainstream SLM into the center of the development agenda.

Despite 191 countries having ratified the UNCCD, progress towards its implementation remain disappointingly slow. African countries, in recognition of their vulnerability to the threat of land degradation and desertification, were instrumental in establishing the Convention. All 53 of them have ratified it and 32 of them have prepared national action plans (NAPs) to combat desertification and poverty, and four sub-regional action programs have also been completed.

These institutional successes have not been matched by action on the ground. There are a number of reasons for this, some of them attributed to above. Another significant factor has been the marginalization of the Convention such that it has never been mainstreamed into the center of development thinking by either African governments or their international partners.

Neither has NEPAD yet received the support that it had hoped for at the launch of CAADP in 2002. Despite the undoubted progress it has made, it remains well short of its targets of US\$ 17.9 billion per year in investment for its four key pillars. Only an international effort that brings together all the key players from donors to researchers, policy makers and implementers can hope to strategically manage and target available resources to achieve the maximum result in the most coordinated manner. To do that, the impediments that have prevented current initiatives from achieving their goals must be analyzed and confronted.

### **Barriers and Bottlenecks**

There are a number of barriers currently in place that must be dismantled if SLM is to take root as a cross cutting and centrally placed development priority. These barriers are seen as covering five key areas and are

rooted in a failure to appreciate the magnitude and importance of the challenge ahead.

- Institutional and sectoral barriers**  
Institutionally, it is critical that some lessons be learned. There will be no mainstreaming of SLM if land degradation issues continue to be negotiated directly with line ministries as if they were purely agricultural or environmental problems. In attempting to scale up the status of SLM negotiations, some pressure will inevitably be felt from line ministries keen to maintain and enhance existing portfolios of external investments. It is hoped that the commitments made at the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness<sup>11</sup> will result in more effective ‘operational development strategies’ that will surmount these institutional impediments to the full development of a cross sectoral agenda. If not, SLM will continue to be pigeonholed as sectoral and remain marginal to the national policy agenda.
- Knowledge Management**  
The management and flow of information has to be radically restructured in order to effectively link research criteria and results from across the various disciplines to the need to develop a coherent picture of root causes and optimal solutions for SLM. Then it must be able to provide such knowledge and information to those managing change on the ground in order to improve both the quality and capacity of SLM implementation. Decision makers, from the political to the local land user, need a clear understanding of why certain options are being presented to them and what the implications of adopting such options might be. Only then can rational decisions be made. This presupposes that research has taken place taking due regard to the social,

<sup>11</sup> February 28-March 2, 2005.

cultural and economic contexts in which decisions are to be made. In the past, this has not often enough been the case and so greater care must be taken to ensure that the research agenda itself is set in conjunction with land users. In conclusion, without an integrated research and information dissemination strategy, the required 'know how' will not become widely available enough to inform an effective implementation of SLM.

- **Policy barriers**

Policy barriers exist at a number of levels and two examples are given that may help in the diagnosis of others.

1. A serious obstacle to the effective implementation of SLM is the variety and complexity of both legal and informal land tenure arrangements which remain unreflected in national policy documents and legal instruments. Wherever there exist tenurial arrangements that are not conducive to investing in land management or improving access to labor, SLM will be impaired. Wherever traditional communal land rights remain unrecognized in law, group rights will remain secondary to individual rights and thus effectively marginalize SLM strategies built around communal rights. Political support is needed to codify and develop a framework that encompasses a broader understanding and acceptance of traditional user rights if land degradation and dispossession are to be halted in many agro-pastoral communities.
2. Links between obstacles to the implementation of SLM and between trade and taxation policies (tariffs, subsidies and pricing) as tools for local and national development and for regional and

international integration have not yet been properly addressed. Until these are understood and accepted, many of the potential social, economic and environmental gains from SLM will remain unrealized.

- **Financial barriers**

Funding levels for SLM have not matched the expectations and the scale of the problem. Furthermore, the funds that have been applied have largely not been targeted at the full range of factors that underpin and exacerbate land degradation. Even if mainstreamed into the center of national development agendas, there is no guarantee that sufficient funds will automatically be made available. The mainstream contains more than one current and the case for SLM will need to be made in as coherent and inclusive a manner as possible if it is not to be overwhelmed by the demands from other key sectors.

- **Implementation barriers**

These result from the conjuncture of the barriers outlined above. If neither the institutional framework nor the policy environment create an appropriate enabling environment, it will be difficult for SLM to emerge as a central component of any national development strategy. If the information -- the 'know how' -- is not made available in a timely and coherent fashion to decision makers, implementers, civil servants and land users, then this disconnect will result in a weakened capacity to respond to the needs of SLM. Getting all of these rights still requires that financial mechanisms are in place that rationalize the disbursement of national resources so as to emphasize development priorities and avoid wasteful duplication.

## **Annex 1 - Conditions for successful SLM in SSA**

### *Political commitment*

The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) recognizes that African economies are vulnerable because of their dependence on primary production and resource-based sectors, and because of their narrow export bases. There is an urgent need to diversify production and the logical starting point is to harness Africa's natural resource base. The African Union adopted the NEPAD strategy for the Continent's development and approved the CAADP that established investment in land and water development as one of its four pillars. This regional commitment needs to be translated at country and local levels.

### *Institutional reforms and strengthening*

Historically, land improvement schemes encouraged land users -- through financial incentives -- to adopt specific soil management and conservation measures. Farmers were the passive recipients of externally derived research and extension recommendations for soil management and conservation; in many cases, such approaches have failed to restore the natural resources and to increase productivity in a sustainable manner.

In SSA, technologies used under SLM will only be successful if they build on local level capacity, involving farmers in technology adaptation and development. Therefore, SLM should consider as a priority to strengthen farmers' skills, knowledge and capability to adapt "promising" technologies to their circumstances and to develop and disseminate their own technologies.

### *Local capacity building*

Whereas in the past, participatory research was seen as a tool to enable external projects better understand local systems and

priorities, it is now the tool of choice for allowing local people to identify and respond to their own development priorities. A succession of Gestion de Terroir models, which sought to promote an integrated and participatory approach to resource management was developed in parallel in the Sahel.

The FAO Farmer Field School approach proves useful to build capacity at local level in topics relating to integrated soil and plant nutrient management and soil and water conservation. Farmer Field Schools can also disseminate local assessment and monitoring methodologies as they are developed by the concerned communities.

### *Sound technical base*

Land resources management in a broader sense is the implementation of land use planning made with the direct participation of stakeholders. It is achieved through political decisions; legal, administrative and institutional execution; demarcation on the ground; inspection and control of adherence to the decisions; solving of land tenure issues; settling of water rights; and issuing of concessions for plant and animal extraction.

FAO's AEZ (agro-ecological zonation) methodology has been refined for within-country level zoning applications (Mozambique, Kenya, Nigeria, and Ghana), where socio-economic conditions have also been taken into account. These conditions figure even more prominently in the programmes for (agro-) Ecological and (socio-) Economic Zoning EEZ - of whole and mainly natural ecosystems. The resulting units are Resource Management Domains (RMDs), i.e. areas within a broad physio-biotic zone that have at present the same socio-economic conditions.

### *Investment and governance*

There are recent examples of successful improved land management practices



implemented under cost-sharing arrangements such as the Land Care programmes in Australia and South Africa. It would seem essential that if subsidies are considered to facilitate SLM adoption, such arrangements be closely link to farmer education and commitment to the long-term introduction of sustainable production systems. Hence, there is a need to associate a broad coalition of donors interested in providing complementary technical assistance and funding to promote innovative practices using financial incentives as a lever (i.e. not only subsidized investments but also risk mitigation measures for early adopters).

## **Annex 2 - SLM: technical options and approaches**

### *Conservation agriculture*

Conservation agriculture (CA) has potential in Africa due to its propensity to control erosion and give more stable yields. There are a number of ongoing initiatives promoting different practices, from conservation tillage up to Conservation Agriculture. Sub-soiling and biological chiselling, using different species of deep rooting plants, can bring spectacular effects due to higher water infiltration and immediate yield increases. Weed management is critical for a successful transition, which may involve using cover crops or chemical weed control.

### *Soil fertility and crop nutrient management*

Soil fertility declines when its nutrient content diminishes, or when soil physical, chemical, and biological composition changes constrain plant growth. Integrated plant nutrition systems techniques (IPNS) aim to increase soil fertility, farm production, and labour productivity. Farmers' options are the use of fertilizers and locally available materials of plant or animal origin as by-products of agricultural activities or, where such materials are not available, *in-situ* production of organics in conjunction with biological nitrogen fixation systems (BNF). In areas and farms where non-cultivated areas are available (forests, pastures, fallows), biomass/nutrient transfers may be feasible to cultivated areas, particularly when appropriately combining various land uses spatially (e.g. agro-sylvo-pastoral systems). Environmental services payments (e.g. C – sequestration) are suitably associated with such systems.

### *Agro forestry*

In traditional agro-forestry Life Support Systems, most tree species provide fuel, fodder, fruit, and other products, even when crops fail, as frequent droughts are a

common phenomenon in many parts of SSA. Silvo-pastoral Systems often cover large areas; they may have low productivity but provide synergies which have sustained livelihoods sustainably for centuries. In Agro-silviculture, mixed food crops grow under trees which do not compete with the crops but improve their growth environment. Wind breaks/shelterbelts reduce wind speed and crop evapo-transpiration, thereby conserving moisture and increasing water use efficiency.

### *Irrigation and water management*

The aim of modern irrigation development must be to make the best use of water in considering available land and human resources, as well as all other essential inputs (energy, machinery, fertilizers, and pest control measures) to enhance and sustain crop production.

In many SSA countries labour is often more readily available than capital and fuel. Irrigation systems for such farmers should aim at self-reliance, i.e. to largely rely on local materials and labour. The process of adaptation may also often require downscaling of the systems to fit the requirements of family holdings.

Water management for in-situ water conservation requires alternative forms of tillage -- such as turning the soil only along plant lines, deep ploughing to break up soil crusts, building raised ridges that follow the contour, growing crops in pits, and building eyebrow terraces around trees and shrubs for improved crop yields and reduced erosion. Such practices contribute to much more efficient use of limited rainfall.

### *Rangeland and livestock management*

The fundamental challenge in rangeland management is to optimize, simultaneously, the interception and conversion of solar energy into primary production and the efficient harvest of primary production by livestock. Grazing management involves the

manipulation of kinds and classes of livestock, stocking rate, grazing season and grazing intensity to optimize these two processes and to maximize livestock production per unit area on a sustainable basis. It may also often involve the resolution of livestock-wildlife competition; such resolution may suitably address compensation schemes for effective environmental and biodiversity conservation/management services.

Climatically induced variation in plant production and the widespread occurrence of selective grazing further complicate the managerial task of optimizing primary production and efficient forage harvest. Traditional pastoralists often use a combination of conservative and opportunistic stocking policies. Options for managing inter-year variability and droughts include maximizing grazing distribution; sale of stock as soon as drought emerges; efficient breeding herd or flock management with minimal number of unproductive animals; use of special-purpose pasture; use of fodders not used in "normal" years; expansion of areas available for grazing; weaning and selling stock earlier; and purchase of supplementary feeds. The movement of livestock to areas less affected by drought at that particular time requires the availability of climatically/ecologically heterogeneous grasslands and livestock policies which take account of sanitary requirements while enabling such crisis mitigation practices.

#### *Methodology approaches*

Promotion of an integrated and synergistic resource management approach reconciles natural systems (climate, landform, soil, land/vegetation cover) and livelihood systems (farming systems including land management systems, socio-eco-cultural systems) into homogeneous management units for SLM interventions. This holistic territorial approach is the starting point for the identification of possible interventions that may embrace locally appropriate

combinations of any of the above technologies to build-up soil organic matter and related biological activity to optimum sustainable levels.

People-centred learning approaches enable farmers to gain and expand knowledge about, and to investigate the profitability of alternative land husbandry practices as the basis for SLM technology dissemination.

**Annex 3 - Table of Acronyms**

AAPP	African Agricultural Productivity Programme
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CAS	Country Assistance Strategy
CF	Consultative Forum
COP	Conference of the Parties
CRIC	Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention
CSO	Civil Society Organization
EC	Executive Committee
FAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GM	Global Mechanism of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
GPP	Global Public Partnership
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
LD	Land degradation
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NAP	National Action Programme
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAGs	Special Advisory Groups
SIP	Strategic Investment Program
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
TLF	TerrAfrica Leveraging Fund
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biodiversity
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WAAPP	West Africa Agricultural Productivity Program

### Annex 4 TerrAfrica: Regional Sustainable Land Management Key Documentation

