



# Processes of Large-Scale Land Acquisition:

Case Studies from Sub-Saharan Africa

Laura German, George Schoneveld and Esther Mwangi



### **Overview**

- Background
- Framework: Processes of large-scale land acquisition
- Legal & institutional frameworks
  - Customary rights protection
  - Large-scale land acquisition
- Large-scale land acquisition in practice\_
- Closing reflections

4 case study countries:

- -Ghana
- -Mozambique
- -Tanzania
- -Zambia



## I. Background

- Increased demand for customary lands:
  - Emerging economies, high commodity prices → food/resource security
  - Economic, environmental & geopolitical concerns → alternative energy
  - Increased flows of FDI (food, fiber, energy, ecosystem services)
- Supply side dynamics:
  - Land policy reforms a condition of WB structural adjustment lending → recognition of customary rights, liberalization of land markets
  - Investment climate reforms ('one-stop shops', tax benefits & subsidies, non-fiscal support)
- Local manifestations of global trends:
  - Targeting of "underutilized" forests / woodlands / rangelands, much of it under customary ownership, to industry



## II. Framework for Assessing Processes of Large-Scale Land Acquisition

- 1. Types, duration of land rights afforded to investors
- 2. Legal recognition of local / 'customary' rights
- 3. Changes in the status / classification of customary land
- 4. Envisioned consultation process:
  - Role of intermediaries
  - Mechanisms for local representation
  - Compensation
- 5. Impact mitigation
- 6. Monitoring
- 7. Dispute resolution
- [8. Mechanisms to guide land identification / allocation]



## II. Framework for Assessing Processes of Large-Scale Land Acquisition

- 1. Types, duration of land rights afforded to investors
- 2. Legal recognition of local / 'customary' rights
- 3. Changes in the status / classification of customary land
- 4. Envisioned consultation process (land, environmental impacts):
  - Role of intermediaries
  - Mechanisms for local representation
  - Compensation
- 5. Impact mitigation
- 6. Monitoring
- 7. Dispute resolution
- [8. Mechanisms to guide land identification / allocation]



#### **III. Case Studies**

**Table 1.** Overview of cases from which findings are drawn

Country	Sectors (number of cases)	Methods
Ghana	• Biofuels (6 companies)	Key informant interviews, fieldwork, archival
Mozambique	<ul><li>Biofuels (4)</li><li>Silvicultural plantations (5)</li></ul>	Key informant interviews, archival
Tanzania	• Biofuels (2)	Key informant interviews, fieldwork, archival
Zambia	<ul><li>Biofuels (3)</li><li>Food crops (1)</li></ul>	Key informant interviews, fieldwork, archival



## III. Legal & Institutional Frameworks

**Table 2.** Formal processes (customary rights protection + land acquisition)

Parameter	Ghana	Mozambique	Tanzania	Zambia
<ul><li>1. Investor rights:</li><li>-Nature</li><li>-Duration</li></ul>	Leasehold ≤ 50 yrs (foreign), 99 yrs (domestic)	Long-term usufruct (DUAT) ≤ 50 yrs	Derivative rights ≤ 99 yrs (≤25 yrs, 20K ha - biofuels)	14-yr → ≤ 99-yr leasehold
2. Recognition of 'customary' tenure	Recognized (w/out title); traditional council approves alienation	DUATs acquired via customary practices (w/out title); land must be 'free and w/out occupants'	Recognized; village council & assembly must approve alienation	Recognized (w/title); chiefs approve alienation
3. Changes in status of customary land	Remains customary, except for compulsory acquisition	Ambiguous (consultations delineate land remaining customary)	Village land → General land prior to acquisition	Customary land → State land prior to acquisition

## III. Legal & Institutional Frameworks

**Table 2.** Formal processes (customary rights protection + land acquisition)

Parameter	Ghana	Mozambique	Tanzania	Zambia
4. Consultation:	No alienation of 'interests' in land of a family or individual w/out consultation	Community consultation in ensuring land is free, delineating community land	Those proposing use of village land 'may, by invitation', address village assembly	'Chiefs must declare' that 'members of the community' were 'consulted'
-Local representation	Traditional Council to represent	Detailed guidelines for delineation	Village Assembly (alienation), Council (compensation)	Chiefs 'must declare' rights protection
-Role of intermediaries	Investment promotion (IP); Lands Commission (land uses)	IP; District administrator (DUATs acquired thru occupation, delineation)	IP; President, Min. of Land (transfer to general land); Lands Commissioner (compensation)	IP/Lands (land ID); District Council (conversion to leasehold)
-Compensation	To state & cust. authorities (by const. formula)	To state; 'terms of agreement' if >10K ha (2008)	For customary land & land uses	To state

## III. Legal & Institutional Frameworks

**Table 3.** Government initiatives to guide large-scale land allocation to investors

Parameter	Ghana	Mozambique	Tanzania	Zambia
Land banks	V		V	$\checkmark$
Industrial-scale agricultural development schemes		√ (agroecological zoning; CEPAGRI)	√ (Kilimo Kwanza)	√ (Farm Blocks)
Targets	Ş	? (zoning: 7M ha available, 3.8M suitable for large-scale agriculture)	√ (20% increase in 'general land')	√ (1 block/province; 947,000 ha since 2004)



- Rights afforded to investors:
  - Customary rather than state land targeted (All)
  - Titles exceeding maximum allowable terms / area for biofuels (Tz)
- Recognition of customary rights:
  - No evidence of compulsory acquisition by the state (negotiated transfer yes)
  - 'Consultations' widespread
- Government initiatives to guide L-S land allocation:
  - Proactive efforts to wrest land from customary authorities (Mz,Tz, Za)
  - Discursive politics (exaggerate benefits, downplay costs e.g., 'degraded land')
  - Transfer to leasehold prior to (e.g., Za) or following expression of interest by investors



- Consultations: Local representation
  - Chiefs, traditional authorities negotiating with no downward consultation or accountability (<u>Gh</u>, Moz, Za)
  - Domination of the process by customary authorities & party leaders;
     involvement of family members rather than comités de gestão (Moz)
  - Deference to customary leaders (Gh, Za), fear of party members (Moz)
  - Elaborate processes condensed into single meetings (Moz)
  - Where legal mechanisms are stronger (e.g., Tz), usurpation of decision authorities by government and coercion undermine due process



#### Consultations: Local representation

- Chiefs, traditional authorities negotiating with no downward consultation or accountability (<u>Gh</u>, Moz, Za)
- Domination of the process by customary authorities & party leaders;
   involvement of family members rather than comités de gestão (Moz)
- Deference to customary leaders (Gh, Za), fear of party members (Moz)
- Elaborate processes condensed into single meetings (Moz)
- Where legal mechanisms are stronger (e.g., Tz), usurpation of decision authorities by government and coercion undermine due process
- Where more meaningful levels of participation exist, lack of legal literacy
   & expectations of 'development' weaken negotiating position

"Lusaka was also at one time a village" – Affected land user, Mpika District, Zambia



- Consultations: Role of intermediaries
  - Investors negotiating directly with Traditional Authorities (Gh):
    - Exploitation common, limited awareness of:
      - Land value, long-term consequences, 'development' prospects
      - Contract law (e.g., unwritten CSR promises)
      - Risks of profit sharing agreements (separate refining companies)



- Consultations: Role of intermediaries
  - Investors negotiating directly with Traditional Authorities (Gh):
    - Exploitation common, limited awareness of:
      - Land value, long-term consequences, 'development' prospects
      - Contract law (e.g., unwritten CSR promises)
      - Risks of profit sharing agreements (separate refining companies)
  - Government mediating land identification, negotiation (Za,...Moz, Tz):
    - Interference from higher levels of govt. in the interest of investors
      - Local govt./leaders encouraged to emphasize benefits, downplay costs (Moz)
      - Communities pressured to accept deals authorized 'from above' (Moz, Tz, Za)
      - Chiefs initially refusing later pressured to accept transfer (Za)
    - Extra-legal negotiations (with provincial, district authorities Tz)
    - Non-participation of mandated authorities (Moz)
    - Checks & balances on customary authorities working contrary to intention



- Consultations: Role of intermediaries
  - Private non-profit mediating land deals for afforestation (Moz):
    - Malonda Foundation created by Council of Ministers as 'public utility' entity 'to incentivize investment'
    - Facilitated 395,000 ha of transfers
    - Widespread transfer of land without community identification, consultation → conflict during implementation



- Consultations: Compensation
  - Where compensation is optional / extra-legal (Moz, Za):
    - Tendency for companies to dominate: jobs/CSR over compensation
    - Agreements vague, lack legal backing (Moz, Za)
    - Investor commitments not honored (bad faith or pull-out) (Moz)
    - Meaningful benefits only following resistance (Moz)
    - Elite capture of benefits (Za): palaces, vehicles, development fund



- Consultations: Compensation
  - Where compensation is optional / extra-legal (Moz, Za):
    - Tendency for companies to dominate: jobs/CSR over compensation
    - Agreements vague, lack legal backing (Moz, Za)
    - Investor commitments not honored (bad faith or pull-out) (Moz)
    - Meaningful benefits only following resistance (Moz)
    - Elite capture of benefits (Za): palaces, vehicles, development fund
  - Where compensation is mandated (Gh, Tz):
    - Agreements which are verbal (e.g., CSR Gh) or not honored (Tz)
    - Tendency to circumvent legislated sharing formulas ('drink money')
    - Tendency for rent capture by powerful actors (60/40 or 100/0 Tz)
    - Variability in what is compensated Tz (annual vs. perennial crops, whether land / communal land is covered, land value, none for forests)
    - Loose definitions a subject of manipulation (e.g., 'degraded' Tz)



## **IV. Closing Reflections**

- Legal protections highly variable
  - Who holds ultimate rights / may grant rights to others (Ghana unique)
  - Whether transfer to state land required prior to transfer (e.g., Tz, Za)
  - Restrictions on area, duration of lease (Tanzania unique)
  - Legislative detail/quality of consultation process: delineation of customary lands (Mz), downward accountability (Tz)
  - Whether compensation is mandated (e.g., Gh, Tz) and for what (land vs. other)



## **IV. Closing Reflections**

#### Legal protections highly variable

- Who holds ultimate rights / may grant rights to others (Ghana unique)
- Whether transfer to state land required prior to transfer (e.g., Tz, Za)
- Restrictions on area, duration of lease (Tanzania unique)
- Legislative detail/quality of consultation process: delineation of customary lands (Mz), downward accountability (Tz)
- Whether compensation is mandated (e.g., Gh, Tz) and for what (land vs. other)

#### ...yet outcomes similar

- Customary land users losing out: failure to exercise rights, limited benefits, high costs
- Weaknesses in legislation (no country stands out on all parameters)
- Limited legal literacy + high expectations → weak bargaining position
- Political interference co-opting process, benefits

