Part 2 – Executive Summary

1. Research plan

1.1. Research questions

The central question of this interdisciplinary project was: How do LSLA influence local actors' configurations (e.g. local councils, "chiefs", farmers' associations, NGOs, intermediaries, traders, landowning farmers, non-land-owning farmers, women), actors' strategies and decision making about the food system, and what are the impacts on the food security (and related food sovereignty) of local women and men?

We approached this main question considering that LSLA are more than a new form of land tenure; we maintained that LSLA are a partial appropriation of the food system with corresponding impacts on gender relations, governance and food security. Consequently, we expected LSLA to have impacts on (1) food production, (2) food processing, (3) food distribution and (4) food consuming, the four constitutive elements of the food system[1], all of which are highly gendered processes. This shift of focus which puts the appropriation of the food system (rather than merely land) in the center of the analysis simultaneously puts gender issues into the limelight.

We examined our overall research question from the perspective of two main questions:

Q1. What are the impacts of LSLA on the configuration of actors who are using, maintaining and organizing the local food system and what coping/resisting strategies do these actors develop?

Q2. What are the impacts of the configurations of actors and their strategies on the local food system in terms of food security?

1.2. Methodology

Research design

LSLA exist in many different forms. In this research, we focused on types of LSLA in which property rights on and access to commons are restricted and in which (at least some) small-scale farmers have the possibility to access to contract farming with investors.

We compared Ghana and Peru. Each PhD- researcher was in charge of one case study (Ghana or Peru). Both countries governments encourage LSLA and consequently have attracted many investors, particularly in the biofuel sector. Furthermore, both countries experience high levels of food insecurity in rural areas. Two related study sites per country were be analyzed using a variety of mainly qualitative methods. We choose countries with a very different cultural, social and economic background in order to test the general validity of our hypotheses («most different system design»)[2]. In other words, if our hypotheses are confirmed in two very different settings, we expect that our conclusions will apply to more average settings as well.

Our analysis took place at three different moments in time: (1) before the implementation of LSLA (t_{-1}); (2) today, i.e. two or three years after the implementation of LSLA (t_0); and (3) in the near future (t_{+1}) as the result of changes resulting from more or less voluntaristic intervention scenarios.

[1] Ericksen P.J., Ingram J.S.I., Liverman D.M. (2009) Food security and global environmental change: emerging challenges. Environmental science and policy 12: 373–377.

[2] Przeworski, A., Teune, H. (1970) The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry. New York, Wiley.

1.3. Investigation, methods and data collection procedure

Our research project was divided into three main phases of research. Dissemination of the results is a transversal task that took place throughout the whole project:

1. Collection of available information: Literature review, first analysis of the institutional regimes at national level (laws, regulation, property rights, court decisions, past LSLA, institutional context, etc.)

2. Field work in Ghana and Peru: First we gathered all relevant written information concerning the study sites: maps, scientific literature, secondary literature, annual reports of commercial actors, statistical data, registry of land titles, contracts, press articles, etc. Second we approached gatekeepers (local chiefs, mayors, teachers, government officials, investors) in each community in order to identify the main actors and actors' networks involved in the opposition or endorsement of LSLA. These actors were interviewed using semi-structured interviews to find out their strategies and networks. Third, we randomly selected a first number of households (the initial sample was further expanded through snowball sampling). Wherever possible a female and a male member of the household were interviewed using semi-structured interviews. Two focus group discussions per community helped us to further highlight differences between the male and female experiences of LSLA.

Institutional resource regime (land tenure law, customary law, public policies): The first part of the semi-structured interview focused on rules and regulation. This was an *in situ* extension of phase 1: the concrete implementation of national rules and regulation, as well as the distribution of property rights and customary law can only be identified through direct interviews of concerned actors.

Actor networks and strategies with a special focus on gender: This second part of the interview helped reconstructing actors' strategies, networks, alliances, common interests, conflicts, etc. We also analyzed if investors consulted with local women and men before/during the appropriation process.

Condition of the food system: The third part of the interview focused on the evaluation of the condition of the food system, i.e. on changes in production, processing, distribution and consumption patterns, as well as individual decision-making power regarding these four processes.

3. Data analysis and writing of SNIS report: Collected documents and interviews were analyzed according to their thematic content. This information was used to analyze the relationship between the analytical variables and to discuss the research hypotheses.

2. Obtained results and analysis

2.1. Ghana

Context: Data was collected during two field stays of 5 and 3.5 months each. In total 30 semi-structured household interviews (10 outgrowers, 10 employees, 10 people who lost land to the investment), 18 biographic interviews, 27 expert interviewees and 5 gender-segregated focus group discussions (FGD) were conducted. The original investor, GADCO, who started operations in 2011, bankrupted in 2014 after the first field study and was taken over by WIENCO, a subsidiary of Syngenta, in 2015. They however continue to use the name of GADCO in their operations.

GADCO was chosen as a case study, since several newspaper articles, as well as a UNDP Report highlighted it as a best practice example of a LSLA[3], mainly due to its "community-private

[3] Darko Osei, R. GADCO – A holistic approach to tackling low agricultural incomes. UNDP Case Study (Link)

partnership model", whereby 2.5% of the company's sales flow into a community development fund, and the company's outgrower scheme, which places high emphasis on including women.

The company is located in Ghana's Lower Volta Region, in the South Tongu District, in the Fievie Traditional Area. Due to its closeness to Accra, the region has experienced an increase in the value of land, as many rich individuals are buying up land along the river for holiday houses and hotels, and various companies also profit from the high quality land to grow rice, fruits and jatropha. Despite high investor interest in the area, there is very high youth unemployment and many young men temporarily migrate to engage in illegal gold mining in other areas of Ghana and Ivory Coast. The area is characterized by a high number of female-headed households and one of the highest teen pregnancy rates in Ghana.

Actor constellation:[4] The implementation of the investment was characterized by a strong involvement of the most educated chiefs, who also had good connections to the central government. The local government was largely bypassed by the investors and chiefs. We find that customary authorities – due to their high bargaining power at the local level and their powerful position in customary land management – play a strategic role as translators between the logics of intervention of the different actors involved in LSLA. *They translate top-down national policies and the investment and development logic of international actors into the customary land tenure system and its complex governance logic.* Their role is to negotiate a new political, social and economic compromise among local actors, newcomers (investors) and the state. They do so through selling the investment to the local population, re-defining local use rights, selecting the exact location for the investment according to existing balance of power, organizing compensation to those affected and combatting resistance against the investment.

As a result of the investment, conflicts within the traditional area and between traditional areas are exacerbated. Customary leaders use the money that flows into the "community development fund" to engage in costly land disputes with neighboring traditional areas. In this context, some local land users are losing their rights to use and access land and natural resources without any compensation (migrants, cattle herders, users of commons – often women). Outgrowers in the company's much-praised outgrower scheme are also selected by chiefs, which leads to a highly skewed distribution towards wealthy individuals and the chiefly elite. Cattle herders and migrants resisted the investment by turning to the media, engaging in violent resistance and turning to state authority, i.e. through letters, appeals and court cases and have been partly successful – i.e. migrants have been partly compensated and the enclosure of the last piece of grazing land has been postponed. Local women, who have been deprived of their access to firewood, have gone onto the company's fields after the first harvest to collect the left-over rice – a practice, which has been allowed by the company.

Access to resources:[5] The plantation enclosed both privately-used farmland and communally-used land, which was used for fuel wood, water, fishponds, trees, seasonal farming, grazing. As a result, there is no more fuel wood left for sale (previously this was one of the main income-generating opportunities for many poor women), no more fish available from fishponds and no more water from ponds (remaining ponds have been made unusable through aereal spraying of pesticides – a practice which the current company has stopped). The access road to one village (Kpevikpo) has been expanded, but then has been cut through by the main irrigation canal, which makes the village inaccessible whenever the company irrigates or there is high rainfall. Kpevikpo is surrounded by the company's land and the heavy spraying of pesticides by GADCO also affected the village's remaining farmland (they were not able to grow crops near company

---

Wan, J. (2013) Ghanaian rice growers cultivate a food security solution. The Guardian (Link).

[4] This sub-section is based on Lanz et al. *(in review)*.

[5] The results of this sub-section are discussed in more detail in Schuppli D. (2016) The Impact of Large-Scale Land Acquisitions on Land Use and Local Actor's Access to Land. A Case Study of Southern Ghana. Master thesis in Geography. University of Bern.

land). Even though, there is still a lot of land available in the Fievie Traditional Area, most of it belongs to families, so anybody wishing to access new land needs to go through these families. As a result, sharecropping arrangements have increased. Rice is now available as a new resource and women engage in collecting the left-over rice from the company's fields.

Food system and food security[6]: The investment has generally led to an increased dependence on the market to buy food and water. Many people who lost access to their farmland have reduced both subsistence and cash crop production. Similarly, the destruction of fishponds, meant that people now have to buy fish on the market. Fish is one of the main parts of the local diet and is eaten with every meal. Destruction of ponds and creeks used for drinking water also meant that many people are forced to buy water now. Those people, who have been integrated into the investment as outgrowers and employees have also partly reduced their own subsistence production due to time constraints.

These reductions in production have also had knock-on effects on food processing and marketization of the affected households.

Almost all interviewees mentioned that they had greatly increased their intake of rice – before the investors came, rice was hardly ever eaten, since the crop is not traditionally grown in the area and buying it on the market is expensive. Now it is eaten almost daily. Many households who had lost land, experienced a decrease in the quality and variety of food (fish eaten much less, food that has to be bought often lesser quality). The aerial spraying of pesticides has also had negative health effects on people and livestock, with some cows perishing as a result. Only few people mentioned reduction in the quantity of food and resulting food insecurity – these were mainly migrants, who had lost all their farmland.

Gender:[7] Despite investor's claims to empower women, the reality looks quite different. The "community development fund", which is supposed to benefit women in particular, is used exclusively by the customary authorities and none of the respondents knew what the money was used for. Even though most outgrowers are women, they are mostly wealthy and elderly women with very close connections to the customary elite. Some important local families have several members in the outgrower scheme, while those who have lost most land, have not been given outgrower positions. General employment patterns actually perpetuate gender stereotypes, with women only being hired in casual, flexible labour positions, such as application of fertilizers, cooking or cleaning. The loss of fuel wood has particularly affected poorer women (often from female-headed households), who have lost an important income-generating activity. The after harvest rice-picking has however partly offset the losses and even led to increased income for some women (those in good health, who have time and many children to help with picking rice).

However, the research has shown that it is highly important to distinguish women by age, lineage, wealth, migration status etc., since women are positioned very differently in the society according to these characteristics and the impact of the investment on them varies accordingly**.**

2.2. Peru

Context: The empirical material gathered in Peru stems from 10 months of fieldwork conducted in 2014/ 2015 in the region of Piura (northern Peruvian coast) in the lowlands of the Chira river basin. The chosen case studies are (1) Maple Etanol, a transnational investor based in Dallas, and (2) Caña Brava, an enterprise belonging to the Peruvian Romero Group, one of the most influential economic groups of the country. Both investors are planting sugar cane for the production of ethanol.

[6] The results of this sub-section will be discussed in the upcoming paper "Entering the global food regime under the disguise of women's empowerment: LSLA as appropriations of local food system".

[7] The results of this sub-section will be discussed in Lanz et al. *(in preparation)*.

Because of the lack of rain water along the Peruvian coast, access to irrigation is crucial. In the last years, the expansion of the hydraulic infrastructure – financed by the state and the World Bank – has considerably improved the performance of small-scale agriculture. Yet, it has also led to an expansion of biofuel enterprises in the valley. As a result, the agricultural frontier in the valley has expanded considerably between 2000 and 2009.[8]

The two biofuel investors did not acquire – with a few exceptions – land from small-scale farmers, but mainly state-owned dry forest land, which increased in value with the access to water provided by the new irrigation infrastructure. This dry forest is used by the local population for different activities such as cattle grazing, firewood, carob fruit and reed collection. During rainy season they also use this common land for the cultivation of crops. Thus, a lot of the conflicts resulting from the acquisition of land by the two investors are rooted in the acquisition of dry forest land that had been used for traditional activities by locals.

Besides, the two biofuel investors also acquired – to a lower extent – privately held land from agricultural associations and individual land owners. Caña Brava also implemented a contract farming scheme and currently approximately 60 farmers are under a sugar cane sale and purchase agreement. Both biofuel investors created approximately 2'600 jobs for fieldworkers, ethanol plant operators and office staff.

Actor constellation:[9] The arrival of large biofuel investments in the Chira valley has led to a new actor constellation, which Revesz & Oliden[10] term "coexistence of large-scale corporate agriculture and small-scale commercial agriculture". Yet, the modalities of this "coexistence" are complex and conflictive. On the one hand side, the acquisition of large surfaces of dry forest land by the two biofuel investors has led to an increasing disappearance and debilitation of traditional land use and tenure systems (e.g. cattle grazing, rainfed agriculture, collecting of firewood or carob fruit). Besides, one of the two biofuel investments is also the source of a territorial conflict with one of the *campesino* communities in the valley, as approximately 1000 hectares of dry forest land from this *campesino* community were located on the area sold to the investor. The intrusion of capitalist farming on community land is also happening through the introduction of a contract farming scheme by one of the investors, through which certain *campesino* community members have started to plant sugar cane on their land. Yet, local actors do not react passively in front of this increasing loss of control over the dry forest land and agricultural surfaces surrounding their villages. They have developed different strategies in order to re-appropriate land lost in the process of land acquisition by the two biofuel investors. Some have started with land titling initiatives in order to protect land from future grabbing by investors. Others have initiated judicial processes with the aim of forcing the investors to land restitution.

The two investors have created new employment opportunities in the biofuel sector and consequently off-farm work has gained importance among local farmers. While many "new rurality" and agrarian change scholars[11] argue that agriculture is losing importance in the context of the expansion and intensification of capital relations, we observed the opposite, namely a slight increase of the smallholder sector in numbers in the last two decades. The latter can be attributed to an emerging export fruit boom in the valley, which various smallholders have joined by engaging in organic fair trade banana production, with major success. What seems to be a major paradox at first glimpse – the re-concentration of land ownership and a simultaneous process of repeasantization – turns out to be after a closer look a logical consequence of the

[8] Maissen, C. (2016) The Impacts of Large-Scale Land Acquisitions on Land Use and on the Local Actors' Access to Land: Evidence from a Case Study in Northern Peru. Master Thesis in Geography, University of Bern.

[9] The results of this sub-section are based on Tejada and Gerber *(submitted)*.

[10] Revesz, B., Oliden, J. (2011) Piura, Transformación del territorio regional. Ecuador Debate, 84, 151-176. Link.

[11] Kay, C. (2015) The Agrarian Question and the Neoliberal Rural Transformation in Latin America. European Review of Latin-American and Caribbean Studies, no. 100, pp. 73-83.

sequence of agrarian reforms in the last decades and also the close interaction between the smallholder and the biofuel investment sector.

Access to resources:[12] The two biofuel investors have gained extensive access to land by purchasing dry forest land from the regional government and from private landowners as well as by introducing a contract-farming system. The water access of the two companies has been ensured by the granting of generous canal and river water rights. The massive transfer of land rights from the state to these private enterprises was made possible through the systematic disregard of the state towards local resource users informal and possession-based land claims. Local land users were systematically excluded from land formalization schemes. As a result, different cattle grazers, farmers, collectors of carob fruit, firewood and reed, have lost access to a central livelihood and also income-generating activity. In addition, the increasing accumulation of water rights in the hands of the two biofuel investments and the increasing scarcity of water in the valley have affected local water users. The shortage of the resource is particularly felt by farmers located in the lower parts of the valley and by landless farmers, who are applying for water licenses in areas not yet cultivated, hoping to also profit from the expansion of the agricultural frontier.

Food system and food security:[13] The Chira valley has experienced a re-orientation towards export agriculture in the last years with the arrival of biofuel investors and the diffusion of crops such as organic banana, maracuyá and mango. The expansion of the agricultural frontier has intensified the competition for irrigation water and has obliged smallholders to substitute their rice plantations with less water-intensive crops, which normally are cash crops (sugar cane, bananas, mangos). Besides, the biofuel investment induced land use changes – sugar cane plantations on land previously used for cattle grazing –, which along with other factors such as the increasing importance of wage labor and a trend towards livelihood diversification, have resulted in a decline in the production of food destined for the local and regional market. Consequently, locally produced food products have become less abundant on local markets, particularly fresh milk, cheese and goat meat have become scarce.

LSLA also resulted in the expulsion of a small farming community. In the cases where the affected cattle-grazers and smallholders not only used their land for subsistence farming, but equally for income-generating activities, the households experienced a strong impact of the LSLAs in terms of food security. Besides, no adequate compensation has been provided to these households and many have not been able to benefit from the company in form of employment, making them particularly vulnerable concerning food security.

In the case of households where a household member – mostly men aged between 22 and 46 – found an employment in the biofuel sector, food security was improved through the provisioning of better income security (employment contract, monthly salary), compared to previous occasional jobs. However, what remains uncertain is the employees' long-term food security, because of the predominantly temporary contracts and insecure employment conditions. In the case of the contract farmers, where their own food production has been reduced in order to plant sugar cane, the household food security has become more dependent on the ability to secure access to food through economic assets. However, sugar cane has proved to be a highly risky business: the failure of the sugar cane cultivation left many small-scale farmers highly indebted.

[12] The results of this sub-section are based on my paper «Seeing land deals through the lens of the 'land-water nexus': The case of biofuel production in Piura, Peru», Journal of Peasant Studies (in press).

[13] The results of this sub-section are based on the master thesis of Debrunner, E. (2016) Of Sugar Cane, Bricks and Carob Trees: Impacts of a Large-Scale Sugar Cane Investment in Northern Peru on Household Food Security. Master Thesis in Geography, University of Bern.

Gender:[14] Along the Peruvian coast the activities on common land appear to be less "gendered" as in the Andean region of Peru, where women and children mostly take care of animal husbandry[15]. In Piura, livestock farming is a shared activity between men and women. Before the installation of the LSLAs on the dry forest land surfaces surrounding the villages, men would take care of livestock and seasonal farming, and women would support them with the collection of carob and forage for the animals and by bringing food to the field. So, the loss of this common land due to LSLA is not primarily affecting women[16]. It is rather a generational dimension which comes into play, as the activities on common land were mainly realized by an older generation (50+), while the younger generation is not interested in working in agriculture. Yet, when it comes to the inclusion of men and women into the land deals, gender is an issue. It is mostly men, who are employed by the new biofuel investors (fieldwork on sugar cane fields, ethanol fabric) as well as in contract farming. Women have been among those most active in resisting the investments and seeking land restitution through judicial processes[17].

3. A summary indicating whether the results obtained correspond to those expected at the beginning of the research

Remark: In this section, we discuss our research hypotheses very briefly. For a full presentation of our results, please refer to the published articles and reports.

Our first hypothesis (H1) was that, since LSLAs are a form of unilateral appropriation of the food system, they have a negative impact on food security.

Our results reveal that LSLAs have a tremendous impact on the local food system. Although not often conceptualized as such, LSLAs are a direct intervention in the spatial planning of a large agricultural area with direct impact on land uses and many public infrastructure (roads, irrigation). Our results show that it is not possible to provide a general answer to H1: some actors – the minority – are able to position themselves to benefit from the investment. Others – the majority – put up with the effects of LSLA on their access/use right to land, on their salaries as potential employees, on their financial resources, on their livelihood. In any case, powerful discourses of modernization accompany the actions of the investors, making it at first difficult for local actors to resist.

We further expected (H1.1) that the private-law nature of LSLA would lead to an impoverishment of democratic decision-making procedures (less transparency and accountability) in the management of the food-system resource (production, processing, distribution, consuming). In this context, we expected local actors to develop strategies to counterbalance this loss.

Local actors are not consulted about the arrival of a LSLA. This is due to the private nature of the land deal. The developers and the powerful actors who support them chose areas where land rights are weaker (customary land, common land, "idle" land, etc.). Therefore, there is no

---

[14] The results of this sub-section are based on a presentation held at the Interdisciplinary Centre for Gender Studies of the University of Bern, entitled «Agrarian Change in Coastal Peru: Some Reflections on Gender Relations and Methodological Implications» (see chapter 5 below for more details).

[15] Jacoby, H.G. (1992) Productivity of Men and Women and the Sexual Division of Labor in Peasant Agriculture of the Peruvian Sierra. In: Journal of Development Economics 37, S. 265–287.

Deere, C.D. (2005) The Feminization of Agriculture? Economic Restructuring in Rural Latin America. UNRISD (Occasional Paper 1).

Deere, C.D., Leon, M. (2003) The Gender Asset Gap: Land in Latin America. In: World Development 31 (6), S. 925–947.

[16] Behrman, J.; Meinzen-Dick, R.; Quisumbing, A. (2012): The Gender Implications of Large-Scale Land Deals. In: Journal of Peasant Studies 39, S. 49–79.

Rossi, A.; Lambrou, Y. (2008): Gender and Equity Issues in Liquid Biofuel Production. Minimizing the Risks to Maximize the Opportunities. Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations (FAO). Rome. Link

[17] Since only men were involved in signing away the land to the private person who subsequently sold it to one of the biofuel investors, women are leading the judicial process against dispossession, claiming their husbands never consulted them regarding the land transaction.

discussion within land using local communities concerning the type of production that will take place (intensive agriculture implying pesticides or irrigation, type of crops, business model, etc.). Local communities are often optimistic, in particular because commercial agriculture is associated with many promises (cash, education, employment, etc.). Therefore, resistance is weak and counter strategies take a long time to emerge. Local communities are never unanimously against the LSLA because some individuals – often the most influential ones – take advantage of it.

In H1.2, we further hypothesized that contract-farming arrangements represent an alternative form of LSLA which could lead to "win-win situations" for both investors and local people in comparison with "classical" LSLA because food producers retain a greater control over the resource.

Our results show that this is clearly not the case. Contract farming rather corresponds to a transfer of risks from the investors to the small landholders, because, if the harvest is bad, the contract farmers bear all the costs. Power asymmetries between investors and smallholders are such, that the terms of the contract are not in favor the smallholders. Investors also implement strategies to control smallholders (e.g. through the terms of the contract, dependencies on irrigation, pesticides or machinery, financial constraints or indebtedness.)

Our second hypothesis (H2) stipulated that LSLA have a differential impact on men and women; considering women's role in the food system, they suffer proportionally more than men from the impacts of LSLA on the food system.

Our empirical results tend to confirm that LSLA reinforces gender disparities. In Peru, mostly men are employed by the biofuel investors. In Ghana, women are only employed as casual labourers, but take on a larger role in the company's outgrower scheme. However, our results point to the fact that mainly wealthy women with connections to the local elite benefit from the outgrower scheme, while poorer women are much affected by the loss of commons, which were used for various purposes. In any case, those women who are involved with the company tend to accumulate tasks as workers in addition to their traditional roles as care takers of their families. Our results point to the fact that it is challenging to formulate generalizations as local communities are not homogenous. Distinction of age, class, socio-economic status, connection with local elites stratify local communities, including women within the communities. Some individuals are able to take advantage of the LSLA while other directly suffer from its impacts. In front of this complexity, our research can be considered a preliminary study. A study of a larger number of households would be needed to evaluate more precisely the impacts of LSLA on social relationships *within* households.

We also expected (H2.1) that, because women tend to be in charge of subsistence-oriented food production and preparation, actors' networks and organizations where women are involved would be more considerate with the sustainable management of the food-system resource.

We did not observe much self-organization or political organization of women. One reason might be that it takes some time for people to realize that the outcomes of LSLA do not correspond to what had been promised. Resisting the powerful ideology of development and modernization is difficult.

We finally hypothesized (H2.2) that the food system would be sustainably and equitably managed, i.e. provide greater food security, if no user of the resources could impose oneself unilaterally in front of the others without agreed compensation.

Our results reveal that compensation is a major issue. In most cases, compensation is insufficient because it is usually based on a one-time payment (for instant for the lost crops). But soon people realize that they have lost access to a resource – agriculture land – that provides a constant flow of benefit, year after year. Power differences are a central problem as well. We

observed tremendous differences among individuals; the most powerful actors usually directly benefit from the investment.

4. Information regarding the practical application of results

4.1. Ghana

In Ghana, initial results were discussed in local dissemination workshops after each field stay. The first dissemination workshop combined a speech on women's land rights by the project's field assistant and K. Lanz's speech presenting initial results. Approximately 200 people from different villages were in attendance, as well as various chiefs and government officials and a company representative. The second dissemination workshop was organized on request of young people from Fievie, who were very frustrated with their leadership and wanted to use the workshop as a platform to address their leaders. The workshop combined a talk about the GCAP Community/Investor Guidelines on Large-scale Land Transactions and a presentation of our results. The youth used the workshop to voice their grievances and later on (after the end of the second field stay) organized to demand accountability and inclusion in the investment from their chiefs, using the recommendations made in the speech. The second dissemination meeting also led to an invitation to discuss our results in the local Radio South Tongu on the 7th of July 2016, which the project's field assistant did.

K. Lanz participated in the National Stakeholder Meeting on the Elaboration of National Guidelines on Large-scale Land Transactions, where she could also bring in some concrete recommendations based on our research. K. Lanz was invited to present our findings at a Mokoro Seminar on "New Research on Women's Land Rights" in Oxford. The seminar brought together many academics, as well as representatives from various British NGOs and Development Organisations. As a result of the speech, K. Lanz was asked to write a policy brief for DfID on "Gender, Land and Agricultural Development", where she could also feed in our research results.

4.2. Peru

At the end of her fieldwork, L. Tejada organized two closing event in the main village of her research area, where she communicated our research findings to the local community and made recommendations regarding the three most affected actor categories (contract farmers, employees, and people having lost access to land).

L. Tejada is also writing a Policy Brief (with 2 other authors) on the impact of water restriction on vulnerable farmers.

5. Questions that merit further exploration

Three main questions appear to be topical for further researches:

1. LSLA are long-term operations. The reaction of the involved population also evolves with time. While first reactions are usually positive (in part because of the powerful discourses of modernity used by supporters), people often start to realize that the reality is quite different from the promises formulated by the investors. There is also a lot of misunderstanding concerning the local repercussions of LSLA in the local population. Therefore, resistance take a long time to organize. It would be very interesting to do long-term studies of LSLA to highlight different phases.
2. LSLA are not isolated interventions, but reflect societies that are changing. LSLA are not only linked with the immediate countryside surrounding their areas, they are closely connected to urban centers. Therefore, it would be interesting to study the impact of LSLA in a broader area, as a manifestation of a changing national economy (transition to capitalism).

3. Studies of intra-household relationships are a real challenge. New studies focusing on larger samples, while still maintaining the in-depth analysis made possible by long-term case studies are needed.

6. Practical and policy recommendations that follow from the results obtained

- Research results should be more broadly disseminated and discussed with development organisations, NGO's, investors, as well as local communities. This could be done through online databases, discussion forums or events that bring together different stakeholders
- Monitoring of funding to companies engaged in LSLA should be more strict. GADCO received funding from various international sources – however, as far as I know, these organisations usually spent only a few days in the research area and rely on biased information from the company, to monitor the company's operations. Again, researchers could play a role here to help with monitoring activities.
- Companies should understand context in which they intervene and therefore move away from purely technical aspects of their operations to investigating and understanding the social and political context (and embedded power relations).
- Local communities must understand the policy and legal context in which these acquisitions take place and be informed of their rights under national and international law and where and how to appeal in case their rights have been infringed.
- Contract farming has been praised as a win-win solution for both investors and small holders[18]. Our results show that a critical appraisal of contracr farming is needed. Local population should be informed of the risks linked with contract farming (transfer of risks).
- LSLA does often not only lead to "land grabbing", but also to "commons grabbing" and "water grabbing". These negative aspects of LSLA need to be discussed openly.

7. Past and expected publications

Lanz K. (2014). The Great African Land Grab: Agricultural investments and the global food system. (Book Review) African Affairs.

Lanz K. (2014). Vers une nouvelle tragédie des terres communes? Accaparement des terres et leurs effets sur l'accès des femmes aux ressources communes. In: POUR Numéro 222 – La revue du groupe ruralités, éducation et politiques. GREP, Paris.

Lanz, K., Gerber, J.-D., Haller, T. *(under revision)*. Large-scale land acquisitions and agricultural intensification in Ghana: Customary authorities at the meeting point of tradition and modernization**.** Development and Change.

Lanz K., Amacker, M., Gerber, J.-D., Prügl E. *(in preparation)*. Entering the global food regime under the disguise of women's empowerment: LSLA as appropriations of local food system.

Oberlack C, Tejada L, Messerli P, Rist S, Giger M. (2016) Sustainable livelihoods in the global land rush? Archetypes of livelihood vulnerability and sustainability potentials. Global Environmental Change 41, pp. 153-171.

Tejada L, Rist S *(accepted)* Seeing land deals through the lens of the land-water nexus: The case of biofuel production in Piura, Peru. Journal of Peasant Studies.

Tejada L, Gerber J.-D. *(submitted)* Land concentration vs. repeasantization? Insights from coastal Peru. Agrarian change.

[18] Deininger, K., Byerlee, D. (2011) Rising global interest in farmland: Can it yield sustainable and equitable benefits? Washington, DC: World Bank.

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.

Tejada L, Rist S *(accepted)* El boom del bioetanol y (re)concentración de la tierra en la costa norte peruana: Luchas agrarias en un contexto neoliberal. In: Durand, L.; Nygren, A.; de la Vega Leinert, C. (eds.): Naturaleza y Neoliberalismo en América Latina.