



The families of Yoel and Adriano Pauccara Huamaní next to the new reservoir built to ensure water and fodder for their alpacas in Coporaque, Peru. Since this reservoir was built with Oxfam support, small-scale producers have influenced local government investments in reservoirs as a climate change adaptation strategy in two districts of Espinar-Cusco. Photo: Percy Ramirez / Oxfam.

BLIND BUDGETS

Budget transparency and public spending for small-scale producers

In Latin America and the Caribbean, national budgets remain blind to the special needs and priorities of small-scale agricultural producers. This undercuts the productivity and food security of millions of women and men who manage small-scale farming operations and who provide up to 60 percent of the food supply. With a new index, Oxfam evaluates budget transparency, accountability, and participation for small-scale producers in the region, and outlines priority areas for improvement. Addressing these would help deliver more and better investment, sustainable livelihoods, and a secure food supply for producers and consumers.

1 INTRODUCTION

In Latin America and the Caribbean, some 15 million small-scale farms play an essential role in the economies and the food security of the region, as well as in the future of the 62 million people who still live in poverty in its rural areas.¹ Women and men in this ‘Small-scale, Family Farming’ sector (AFC is the Spanish acronym used in parts of the region and the remainder of this report²) produce nearly 40 per cent of the agricultural Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in Brazil and Mexico, and more than 60 per cent of the GDP in Central America.³ Considering the three great challenges faced by agricultural food systems worldwide – fair distribution, environmental sustainability, and resilience to climate and economic shocks⁴ – the enormous potential of the AFC sector to sustainably increase its agricultural productivity is even more important.⁵ Investment in AFC, in addition to being strategic for domestic economies, food sovereignty, and food security, is an efficient way of reducing poverty: growth in the small-scale farming sector has up to twice as much impact on poverty as growth in other sectors.⁶

For all these reasons, the governments of Latin America and the Caribbean are increasingly talking about the importance of AFC. In their declaration for the 2012 Summit of the Americas, Ministers of Agriculture made a commitment to train small-scale farmers and to facilitate their integration into value chains.⁷ Several countries have established policies seeking to prioritize investment in ‘small-scale farmers,’ (though exact definitions vary). Since 2004, following the lead of the Brazilian government, Mercosur countries have created the Specialized Meeting on Family Agriculture (REAF), which has defined common criteria for AFC and established a sub-regional policy to strengthen it.⁸ The Central American Strategy for Rural Territorial Development (ECA-DERT) also includes a definition of ‘family agriculture,’ and the Andean Community is currently working on developing guidelines.⁹

To what extent are these intentions backed up by effective policies and institutional arrangements to maximize the potential of AFC? In 2011, Oxfam showed that, despite the fact that AFC was the predominant means of production in South America, it had been practically forgotten by national agricultural policies, and disadvantaged by public expenditure in the sector.¹⁰ This year, Oxfam has explored the issue once again from two perspectives: In ‘From Promises to Priorities’ we study the scale and composition of AFC-related expenditures in the region;¹¹ and in this Briefing Note we evaluate budget transparency, accountability, and participation as they affect small-scale producers.

If states do not have statistical databases that differentiate between women producers and large agribusinesses, how can they draft and implement effective policies for AFC? Without access to detailed information on public expenditure relevant to small-scale rural producers, how can we evaluate its adequacy or effectiveness? Without effective accountability, how can we know if investments respond to the objectives and potential of the sector? And if rural women and men cannot participate in relevant budgetary decisions, how can we make sure that investments respond to their needs and priorities?

These are the concerns that motivate this paper. Underpinning them is a conviction while the quantity of public expenditure is the firmest expression of political will, its quality largely depends on the state capacity to ensure budget transparency, accountability, and participation. Six of the 10 countries analysed in this paper¹² have notably improved their general performance in these areas since 2010 (see Δ IPA 2010, Table 1).¹³ However, while these improvements in budget management and transparency may have helped citizens better to exercise their civil and political rights, the most excluded populations in the region – including the majority of small-scale, family farmers – have yet to experience improvements that deliver results for their livelihoods, economic standing, and food security.

In order to contribute to an assessment of budget management and transparency in areas linked to AFC in Latin America and the Caribbean, this paper presents a Budgetary Transparency Index for Small-scale, Family Farming (ITP-AFC). Section 2 explains the Index and its main messages. Section 3 summarizes the most effective measures being applied in the region in relation to this issue, and Section 4 identifies the key policies that can help maximize the great potential that AFC offers to achieve more equitable, environmentally sustainable, and resilient food systems.

2 WHO STANDS OUT?

In order to evaluate budget management and transparency for AFC in the region, Oxfam commissioned research in 10 countries. In contrast to general surveys of budget transparency, such as the Open Budget Survey (see below), each of the research teams focused on a common set of research questions that asked how governments are performing over the course of the budget cycle in relation to the specific needs of small-scale producers in four areas: basic data, accountability, access to information, and participation. On the basis of official budget information available – and their own experience accessing that information – the research teams evaluated the performance of their respective governments. This process generated more than 450 relevant observations, which were reviewed and scored to create an Index of Budget Transparency for AFC (ITP-AFC is the Spanish acronym) ranking each country, presented in Table 1, below (for further details on methodology see Annex 1).

What conclusions emerge? The general conclusion is that all of the 10 countries evaluated have room for improvement. The main challenges are, on the one hand, to greater political priority for budgetary transparency in general – not necessarily specific to AFC – and, on the other, compliance with the national laws and policies already in place.

Table 1: Budget Transparency Index for AFC (ITP-AFC)

Country	OBI 2012 [†]	Δ OBI 2010	ITP-AFC Score [‡]				
			Data	Accountability	Access to information	Participation	TOTAL
<i>Brazil</i>	73	+2	10	16	17	19	62
<i>Peru</i>	57	-8	3	16	21	19	59
<i>Mexico</i>	61	+9	13	19	8	13	53
<i>El Salvador</i>	43	+6	13	6	17	13	49
<i>Bolivia</i>	12	+1	5	6	4	19	34
<i>Paraguay</i>	--	--	18	3	4	6	31
<i>Colombia</i>	58	-3	3	13	8	6	30
<i>Haiti</i>	--	--	8	6	8	6	28
<i>Nicaragua</i>	42	+5	5	3	17	0	25
<i>Dom. Rep.</i>	29	+15	5	3	8	6	22

Source: For OBI, Open Budget Index (<http://internationalbudget.org/wp-content/uploads/OBI2012-Report-English.pdf>). For ITP-AFC, Oxfam analysis based on national research. For the methodology underpinning the ITP-AFC, see Annex I.

[†] The OBI is a global index of budget transparency. The 2012 scores for each country are included for reference; in a scale from 1 to 100, 0 to 20 means no or scarce information, 21–40 = minimum information, 41–60 = some information, 61–80 = significant information, and 81–100 means extensive information. The column 'Δ OBI 2010' shows the change between OBI scores from 2010 to 2012.

[‡] The ITP-AFC is measured on a scale of 0 to 100, where 0 means that the conditions to deliver effective policies for AFC do not exist, and 100 means that all the necessary conditions exist.

An analysis of budget management and transparency for AFC cannot be separated from budget transparency management in general. For the sake of comparison, the Open Budget Index (OBI)¹⁴ is also presented in

Table 1. The close correlation between the OBI score and the ITP-AFC is not surprising. In general, states take measures regarding transparency, accountability, and participation for all their sectors and activities – not only for a particular sector. Therefore, those countries that stand out due to their low score in the Index, such as Bolivia, Nicaragua, and Dominican Republic, also face the pending challenge of greater investment in improved budget management and transparency in general. However, the existence of good practices in general terms does not necessarily guarantee positive performance in terms of the needs of the AFC sector. For example, although Colombia has the third highest OBI score in the region, it ranks seventh in the ITP-AFC. Maintaining good budget management and high levels of transparency in general are necessary but insufficient conditions to guarantee effective policies in support of AFC.

It is clear that all countries – including the regional leaders that stand out because of their high scores – still have considerable room for improvement. Despite the fact that Brazil, Mexico, and Peru are often considered as reference points for the region in terms of budget transparency, the analysis shows that none of these countries complies with more than two-thirds of the key conditions described in Annex 1. This result is also reflected in the OBI, where we see that Brazil, which takes the regional crown with 73 points, still has work to do in order to reach the 100 points of total transparency. None of the countries evaluated enjoys the optimum conditions to deliver an effective policy in support of AFC.

The case of Paraguay also stands out because, in spite of its relatively weak institutional capacity (reflected in low scores for access to information, accountability, and participation), it maintains a higher overall score thanks to the political priority it has given to AFC, which is reflected in the existence of basic information specific to AFC and intergovernmental coordination. Like Brazil, Paraguay has included a definition of the AFC concept in its legal framework and has also committed to several programs and initiatives aimed specifically at this sector. It is clear that adopting a legal definition of AFC does not resolve all the budget management and transparency problems. But it stands to reason that tangible progress in policies favouring AFC will always be more difficult to achieve if the subjects of those objectives are not clearly defined. Clarifying and specifying the characteristics of the target population that a public policy seeks to benefit is the fundamental starting point for any coherent public policy.

Lastly, it is important to point out that the degree of compliance with relevant legal obligations is very low throughout region. As examples, national legislation in the Dominican Republic requires elaboration of a consolidated national budget broken down by programme or intervention, but the state has yet to comply with this requirement. Likewise, recent changes in the way the Government of Brazil presents its national budget mean that implementing agencies can move resources between different purposes over the course of the budget cycle provided they don't change the broad classification of the intervention. In practice, this makes spending opaque, frustrates transparency, and flies in the face of the Access to Information Law recently approved by the same government. No country analyzed had the highest possible score in this variable, positioning it as a reference point for good practice in the region. In other words, if governments in the region complied to the letter with their own laws and policies relating to budget management and transparency issues, they could guarantee better results for AFC.

3 WHAT IS WORKING?

Comparative scale aside, the analysis underpinning the Index also provides important learning and experience about practical measures to improve budget management and increase transparency for AFC. Here we mention three particular lessons that are equally relevant to all the countries studied.

DISAGGREGATE DATA

The importance of specifying and applying a definition of the most relevant population and/or productive units for AFC to the entire budget cycle in a country context has already been mentioned. The exact definitions included by Brazil and Paraguay may not be relevant in El Salvador¹⁵ or the Dominican Republic, but having a concept more specific than just ‘the agriculture sector’ is key, even more so considering the endless gaps and inequalities that characterize the rural environment in all countries in the region.¹⁶

Defining a subsector that is relevant to the AFC context requires the disaggregation of the statistical information used in the budget cycle. This allows for differentiated analysis of the rural population involved in productive activities; of the geography of agricultural food production; and of the productive units and activities. This is done in the exemplary cases in the region: Brazil, Mexico, and Paraguay. Although Mexico does not have a legal definition specific to AFC, it maintains a census of local municipalities (*ejidos*) that includes land tenure, family income, and other socio-demographic and productive characteristics. Agricultural censuses in Brazil and Paraguay disaggregate information by gender in addition to municipality, age, and area under production (urban/rural).

Disaggregating information about beneficiary populations of small-scale producers by gender is especially important given the key role that women farmers play in AFC. In the case of Peru, information disaggregated by gender can be found in reports by the Ministries of Health and Women, but the Ministry of Agriculture still only disaggregates information about target populations by family and/or producer. Information disaggregated by gender is critical so that women producers can see and question the impact of planned, budgeted, and/or implemented actions.

Just as the government itself requires disaggregated data to define the most relevant and effective policies for AFC, citizens also need this information. Mexico and Peru stand out in this area. Although there are still some difficulties when making all disaggregated information available to AFC women and men farmers, the information they publish does allow the examination of expenditure at program level and, in the case of Peru, it can also be cross-referenced with information in the region or the municipality to which it was earmarked. The challenge faced by Peru

(and many other countries) is making the information understandable to farmers and other interested citizens who do not have a good knowledge of the technical language in which it is currently presented. Brazil used to do it this way but since it recently adopted a new methodology for its multiannual plan, it no longer disaggregates information by intervention, preventing the more detailed analysis that small-scale producers require.

EVALUATE RESULTS

Many governments in the region fail to correct the level or quality of their budgetary spending according to the results of expenditure in previous years. This is especially notable for expenditure in areas that are relevant to AFC. In order to guarantee improvements in its results-based expenditure performance, Mexico has a Performance Evaluation System that allows, ‘...an objective assessment of the programs’ performance [...] based on strategic and management indicators that allow us to learn about the social impact of programs and projects.’¹⁷ The National Council for the Evaluation of Social Development Policy (CONEVAL) is also relevant to the AFC. It links results with achievements towards more comprehensive social development goals, including, in some cases, the achievement of a social right.

Likewise, Peru has been implementing a results-based budget program system for the past two years, an initiative inspired by Chile’s budget process. Analysis of results from the entire budget, distributed by program, is expected to be available in 2016, with indicators that facilitate improved monitoring and an evaluation of the impacts of investments. This system also needs link actions at the different levels of the state and among different governmental actors at the national level, which would support better coordination and more integrated policies, which are especially important for AFC.

PROMOTE PARTICIPATION IN DECENTRALISED SPACES

Here are some illustrative examples of good practice in terms of citizen participation in budgetary processes relevant to the AFC subsector:

- Dominican Republic: At the local government level, the participatory budget concept has been introduced to establish mechanisms for citizen participation in the discussion, drafting, and follow-up of the municipal budget.¹⁸ This is intended especially to address the 40 per cent transfer that municipalities receive from the National Budget, which they must earmark for capital expenditures and investment, as well as their own income applicable to these areas.¹⁹
- Nicaragua: The legal framework governing cooperatives includes provisions that help guarantee representation of and by women producers, which can help deliver benefits for women’s participation in the budget process.

- Peru: There are many experiences in the country regarding municipal management with proactive transparency and citizen participation policies. One example is the District Municipality of Coporaque-Cusco, a rural area in which pastoral (alpaca) livelihoods are predominant. At the end of each budget cycle (year), an accountability session is organised to report back to the population on the results of public spending. This allows citizens to understand what was decided previously, and to participate in the budget process by tabling proposals designed by communities. In the last budget cycle, in line with community priorities, the Municipality of Coporaque earmarked 80 per cent of the participatory budget for the construction of water reservoirs. These help guarantee water resources during the dry season, when it is increasingly difficult to maintain pastures and fodder for livestock due to accelerated glacial melt associated with global climate change.
- Brazil: A National Council on Sustainable Rural Development, the states, and many municipalities have local councils dealing with budgetary spending. Government entities and the main civil society organizations involved in sustainable rural development, family farming, and agrarian reform also participate. The councils analyze spending and propose thematic and budgetary priorities. The system also includes national conferences with local representation, which define priorities for policies and also evaluate progress in a periodic manner.²⁰

4 WHAT IS MISSING?

The Index presented in this Note and the analysis supporting it show that understanding the trends and policy priorities reflected in public expenditure relevant to AFC in Latin America is still a major challenge. The root cause? A lack of effective budget transparency, accountability, and participation in areas critical for small-scale producers. If it is difficult for experts to draw accurate conclusions regarding budgetary spending, how can we expect small-scale producers to do so? Overcoming this massive obstacle is a critical and urgent priority, and 2014 as International Year of Family Farming is a chance to get things right.²¹ Improvements would help promote well-grounded debates about the quality and quantity of public investment AFC – and help realise the civil and political rights of all citizens, who are both frustrated by opacity of and corruption in public spending, and concerned about the security and sustainability of the region's food systems.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Countries with the lowest scores on the ITP-AFC – including Bolivia, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Paraguay – need to invest in reforms aimed at improving their budget management and increasing transparency in general, thus enabling strategic planning of their budgetary spending on AFC. In line with recommendations from the Open Budget Survey, this starts with ensuring that, 'at least a minimum set of budget documents, including the Executive's Budget Proposal, the Enacted Budget, the Audit Report, and the Citizens Budget, are published in a regular and timely manner, and that public hearings are held to disseminate budget information and to gather citizen views on budget policies.'²² Prioritizing hearings for groups of women and other small-scale producers makes sense in these countries and would help address the obstacles they face in understanding public spending.

Countries that do not have legal definitions or policy frameworks that single out the AFC sector need to define the target population that makes sense in their contexts in order to guarantee expenditures that are tailored to the special needs and priorities of small-scale producers, including women specifically. Given the growing attention to AFC needs and priorities, Colombia stands out as an anomaly and small-scale producers there would benefit considerably from this change.

All countries should comply with their existing legal obligations relevant to the AFC sector and with transparency, accountability and citizen participation more generally. They should also identify ways to improve their performance in areas that are specifically important to the AFC sector, beginning with:

- Disaggregated demographic, geographic, and productive information (by gender and other key variables);
- Monitoring and evaluation processes that comprehensively measure achievements and results from spending and relate these to the realization of socio-economic rights, including the right to food and the extent to which the priorities of women producers are met;
- Improved access to information relating to public spending in areas relevant to small-scale, family farming, including especially non-technical summaries of spending priorities and support resources that facilitate prompt responses to queries lodged by small-scale producers;
- Formal, decentralized spaces that allow the participation of small-scale farmers in the drafting, monitoring, and evaluation of public spending priorities that affect them.

ANNEX 1: METHODOLOGY

The Index is derived from the ranking of specific research observations against 14 variables considered key to budget transparency, accountability, and participation over the course of the budget cycle from the AFC point of view, organized in four dimensions of the Index (see Chart 1 below).

Chart 1: Four dimensions of the ITP-AFC Index

1. Information and coordination

- 1.1 Are there legal definitions and obligations specific to the AFC sector (or any population that would be part of this sector)?
- 1.2 Is disaggregated information on the farming sector population generated and used in the entire budget cycle?
- 1.3 Is disaggregated geographic information generated and used in the entire budget cycle?
- 1.4 Is detailed and differentiated information on the productive activity of beneficiaries generated and used in the entire budget cycle?
- 1.5 Is there functional intersectoral coordination for a comprehensive approach in AFC requirements?

2. Accountability

- 2.1 Is there effective control and oversight of entities responsible for AFC-related expenditure?
- 2.2 Are the state and its offices monitoring and evaluating the results and achievements relevant to AFC in an effective manner?
- 2.2 Are detailed comparisons of expenditures made vs. expenditures approved (in areas relevant to AFC) being drafted and published?
- 2.3 Is the state fully complying with all legal obligations pertaining to the AFC sector?

3. Access to information

Is all information relevant to the AFC sector:

- 3.1 Available and accessible to women and men farmers in the sector?
- 3.2 Presented in a way that allows them to clearly understand it?
- 3.3 Published in a timely manner?

4. Participation

- 4.1 Are there formal channels or mechanisms for the active participation of AFC sector producers in the entire budget cycle?
- 4.2 Is it easy for AFC farmers to influence all phases of the budget cycle (regardless of whether or not there are formal channels)?

Experts in issues relating to budget monitoring and AFC were commissioned by Oxfam to undertake national research in their respective countries in 2012. Based on guidelines including a common set of research questions, researchers evaluated official information available in each country and made judgments relating to each dimension, which were written up in a national research report. No surveys were conducted as part of this research.

Each relevant observation from the national research reports was evaluated by the author, who assigned it a score from 0 to 2, in which 0 means that the variable is not fulfilled with at all; 1 means that it is met to a certain extent (but with critical deficiencies); and 2 means that it serves as an example of best practice in the LAC region in that particular area.

Scores were aggregated and organized according to the 14 variables defined for the four dimensions of the Index (see Chart 1) in order to specify a ranking for each country. Each of the four dimensions – information and coordination, accountability, access to information, and participation – was given equal weighting, with 25 representing the maximum possible score for each dimension, and 100 representing the maximum possible score for the Index as a whole.

NOTES

¹ For estimates of the number and composition of small-scale farming operations in the region, see: **J. A. Berdegue and R. Fuentealba** (2011), 'Latin America: The State of Smallholders in Agriculture,' paper presented at the IFAD Conference on New Directions for Smallholder Agriculture, 24–25 January 2011, Rome, <http://www.ifad.org/events/agriculture/doc/papers/berdegue.pdf> (last accessed July 1, 2013). Assuming a relationship between the productivity of small-scale, family farms and rural poverty levels does not deny the importance of rural–urban mobility or of economic diversification in rural areas. As in sub-Saharan Africa and other regions, these dynamics are well known in Latin America and the Caribbean and some observers question the effectiveness of agriculture as a poverty reduction engine in rural areas. However, the consensus among agricultural economists continues to be that these dynamics cannot be considered in isolation but rather are mutually reinforcing; synergies between rural-urban, and between agriculture and non-agricultural sectors are essential for rural development and poverty reduction (see: Session 4: Employment, Migration, and the Non-farm economy, pp. 135–86 in **International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) / 2020 Vision Initiative, Overseas Development Institute (ODI), Imperial College, London** (2005) 'The Future of Small Farms: Proceedings of a Research Workshop,' Wye, UK, 26–29 June 2005, <http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/publications/sfproc.pdf> (last accessed July 1, 2013)).

² We use this term, 'Small-scale, family farming' (AFC) to refer to the group of producers, including indigenous communities, whose operations are managed by a family unit, depend mainly on the family's labour, and cover a relatively small area of land. Brazil and Paraguay have official definitions of AFC, El Salvador uses a definition of 'family agriculture,' and other countries single out 'small-scale producers' in their policies. A formal definition is not needed for countries to tailor policies to the specific needs and priorities of this sector, nor is it necessary for all countries to use the same definition. But it is possible to identify a group of people whose livelihoods depend on what we call AFC in all the countries of the region, and the premise underpinning this report is that states should do so in order to shape policies and budget priorities accordingly. This is an essential condition for achieving progress on food security, poverty reduction, and economic and social equality in Latin America and the Caribbean.

³ **K. F. Nwanze**, 'Smallholder farming key to development in Latin America and the Caribbean,' Editorial on IFAD website, IFAD, http://www.ifad.org/events/op/2009/editorial_brazil.htm (last accessed 1 July, 2013).

⁴ **R. Bailey** (2011), 'Growing a better future: Food justice in a resource-constrained world,' Oxfam GROW campaign report, <http://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/cr-growing-better-future-170611-en.pdf> (last accessed 1 July 2013).

⁵ This applies in the LAC region, but also globally, where some 500 million small-scale farming operations produce food for almost 2 billion people in developing countries – almost one-third of the world population. See **IFAD**, 'Food prices: smallholder farmers can be part of the solution,' Editorial on IFAD website, <http://www.ifad.org/operations/food/farmer.htm> (last accessed 1 July, 2013).

⁶ **FAO** (2009), 'How to Feed the World in 2050.' It has also been proven that small-scale production is more effective from the economic standpoint than plantations, where day labourers work. Small-scale agriculture, in addition, has an enormous impact on employment, unlike highly mechanized agriculture. **V. Songwe and K. Deininger** (2009), Foreign Investment in Agricultural Production: Opportunities and Challenges, World Bank, p3, <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTARD/Resources/335807-1229025334908/ARDNote45a.pdf> (last accessed July 1, 2013).

⁷ Specifically, they made a commitment to, 'Promoting [...] access to technology and capacity building for small-scale producers,' as well as to 'Supporting technological and institutional innovations that: facilitate greater integration of the agrifood sector—including small-scale producers—in the value chains.' Declaration of the Ministers of Agriculture, San Jose 2011, of the Meeting of Ministers of Agriculture of the Americas, 'Sowing innovation to harvest prosperity,' paragraphs 15 and 23, http://www.iica.int/Esp/prensa/Documents/JIA2011Declaracion_esp.pdf (last accessed July 1, 2013). It is worth noting that, with the exception of the Ministerial Agreement of the Americas of 2009 (Jamaica), the Ministers had not made a single reference to 'small-scale producers' since their first statement in 2001.

⁸ See <http://www.reafmercosul.org/reaf/>. 'In 2007, Mercosur established common criteria for the identification of rural farmers of the bloc. Based on these criteria, the countries created their voluntary registries. Brazil already had a DAP. 'Today, Mercosur is the only region in the world that has established common criteria for the identification of its farmers. Based on these criteria, all the countries in the bloc are drafting policies that specifically benefit the farmers listed in the registry. The next step will be mutual recognition,' Pierri explains.' http://portal.mda.gov.br/portal/noticias/item?item_id=10713219 (last accessed July 1, 2013).

⁹ The Central American Strategy for Rural Territorial Development (ECADERT) was approved on 12 March 2010 and defines 'family agriculture' as the 'small-scale agricultural production carried out in plots that represent domestic units of production and consumption, with unpaid family labour as their main labour force.' (**Central American Agricultural Council** (2010), 'Central American Strategy for Rural Territorial Development 2010-2030,' Central American Integration System (SICA), p. 98., http://www.sica.int/busqueda/busqueda_archivo.aspx?Archivo=libr_48070_3_05072010.pdf (last accessed July 1, 2013)).

¹⁰ **A. Guereña** (2011), 'Derecho a Producir: Invertir más y mejor en la pequeña agricultura de América del Sur,' Oxfam Research Report, http://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/derechoaproducir_oxfamcrece-04102011.pdf (last accessed 1 July 2013): 'The best way to tell if a government is complying with its political promises is the analysis of how public money is being used.' p. 17.

- ¹¹ See companion Oxfam Briefing Note, 'From promises to priorities: Putting small-scale, family producers at the centre of a fair food production system in Latin America and the Caribbean,' July 2013.
- ¹² The 10 countries studied include Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, and Peru. They are all countries in which Oxfam-GROW campaigns are actively supporting advocacy and campaigning for quality and quantity of public investment in small-scale producers.
- ¹³ IPA is the Spanish for Open Budget Index (OBI), published bi-annually by the International Budget Partnership as a general measure of government performance on issues of budget transparency, accountability, and participation. See **E. Mondo et al.** (2012), 'Open Budget Survey 2012: Open Budgets. Transform Lives,' International Budget Partnership, <http://internationalbudget.org/wp-content/uploads/OBI2012-Report-English.pdf> (last accessed 1 July 2013).
- ¹⁴ **E. Mondo et al.** (2012), 'Open Budget Survey 2012: Open Budgets. Transform Lives,' International Budget Partnership, <http://internationalbudget.org/wp-content/uploads/OBI2012-Report-English.pdf> (last accessed 1 July 2013). See also the related, Latin American Index of Budget Transparency: <http://www.iltpweb.org/> (last accessed 17 July 2013).
- ¹⁵ In the Family Agriculture Plan (PAF), family agriculture is defined as 'families that mainly undertake productive activities in farming, forestry, fishing, and aquaculture, who use family labour in their processes, generate economic income, and contribute to the food and nutritional security of their regions.' **Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)** (2012), 'La FAO y la Agricultura Familiar: El caso de El Salvador,' p. 11, <http://transparenciaactiva.gob.sv/privado/La%20FAO%20y%20la%20Agricultura%20Familiar.pdf> (last accessed 1 July 2013).
- ¹⁶ **A. Guereña** (2011), *op. cit.*
- ¹⁷ See <http://www.funcionpublica.gob.mx/index.php/ua/ssfp/uegdq/sed/sed-definicion.html> (last accessed 17 July 2013).
- ¹⁸ Law No. 176-07 of the National District and the Municipalities, in article 236, establishes the Municipal Participatory Budget (PPM) system and envisages both participatory budget processes and open meetings of local councils.
- ¹⁹ Each city council must establish through regulations how these resources will be earmarked by zone and work. One of PPM's main principles is access by all citizens to community assemblies in each location or community, to sectional assemblies, to neighbourhood or block assemblies, and to the Open Meeting of the Council or Municipal Assembly. In this sense, all members of the community have the right to participate and they must elect their representatives in the zone assembly process so that they can become members of the Zone and Municipal Follow-up and Control Committees. A technical team appointed by the city council needs to participate in the organization of the process. In addition, the mayors and municipal councilmen are called to participate in the different phases of the process, pursuant to Law 176-07.
- ²⁰ The National Council for Rural Sustainable Development (CONDRAF), is a collegiate body that is part of the basic structure of the Ministry of Agrarian Development, whose mandate is to propose guidelines for the formulation and implementation of active public policies, and to become a space for consensus-building and coordination among the different levels of government and civil society organizations in the areas of sustainable rural development, agrarian reform, and family agriculture. The main objectives of the Council are: to contribute to overcoming poverty through the generation of employment and income to reduce inequalities in income, gender, age groups and ethnic group, and to the diversify economic activities to foster the adoption of participatory social control instruments in the phases of public policy planning and execution for sustainable rural development.
- ²¹ See <http://familyfarmingcampaign.net> (last accessed 9 July 2013).
- ²² **E. Mondo et al.** (2012), 'Open Budget Survey 2012: Open Budgets. Transform Lives,' International Budget Partnership, <http://internationalbudget.org/wp-content/uploads/OBI2012-Report-English.pdf> (last accesses 1 July 2013), p. 42.

This paper was written by Antonio Hill. Oxfam acknowledges the collaboration of the following researchers and institutions linked to this project in the countries analyzed: José Antonio Peres Arenas and Gustavo Medeiros Urioste (Centro de Estudios y Proyectos S.R.L.- CEP) (Bolivia); Nathalie Beghin, Alessandra Cardoso, and Edelcio Vigna (Instituto de Estudos Socioeconômicos –INESC) (Brasil); Juan Carlos Villamizar (Colombia); Evelyn Patricia Martínez (Fundación Salvadoreña para la Reconstrucción y el Desarrollo - REDES) (El Salvador); Eddy Labossiere (Haïti); Héctor M. Robles Berlanga and Ana Joaquina Ruíz Guerra (Mexico); Adelmo Sandino, Claudia García, and Joaquín Bárcenas (Instituto de Estudios Estratégicos y Políticas Públicas - IEEPP) (Nicaragua); Verónica Serafini Geoghegan (Paraguay); Epifanio Baca Tupayachi (Perú), and; Pavel Ernesto Isa Contreras and Mariana Barrenese (Dominican Republic). All judgments and conclusions reflected in the Index presented in this paper remain the responsibility of the author rather than these researchers.

Oxfam also acknowledges the assistance in the production of this paper of Marcelo Arandia, Susana Arroyo, Lourdes Benavides, Patricia Bordier, Walden Borja, Jorge Cortés Fajardo, Lies Craeynest, Lorena del Carpio, Yuritzin Flores, Analuce Freitas, Amelie Gauthier, Rafael Henríquez, Tonny Joseph, Oscar López, Ana Iris Martínez, Silvio Minier, Cecilia Niezen, Adriana Rodríguez, Susana Ruiz, Muriel Saragoussi, and Giovanna Vásquez.

It is part of a series of papers written to inform public debate on development and humanitarian policy issues.

For further information on the issues raised in this paper, please email advocacy@oxfaminternational.org

This publication is subject to copyright but the text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in any other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. Email policyandpractice@oxfam.org.uk.

The information in this publication is correct at the time of going to press.

Published by Oxfam GB for Oxfam International under
ISBN 978-1-78077-376-6 in July 2013.
Oxfam GB, Oxfam House, John Smith Drive, Cowley, Oxford, OX4 2JY, United Kingdom.

OXFAM

Oxfam is an international confederation of 17 organizations networked together in more than 94 countries, as part of a global movement for change, to build a future free from the injustice of poverty:

Oxfam Germany (www.oxfam.de)
Oxfam America (www.oxfamamerica.org)
Oxfam Australia (www.oxfam.org.au)
Oxfam-in-Belgium (www.oxfamsol.be)
Oxfam Canada (www.oxfam.ca)
Oxfam France (www.oxfamfrance.org)
Oxfam GB (www.oxfam.org.uk)
Oxfam Hong Kong (www.oxfam.org.hk)
Oxfam India (www.oxfamindia.org)
Intermon Oxfam (Spain) (www.intermonoxfam.org)
Oxfam Ireland (www.oxfamireland.org)
Oxfam Italy (www.oxfamitalia.org)
Oxfam Japan (www.oxfam.jp)
Oxfam Mexico (www.oxfammexico.org)
Oxfam Novib (www.oxfamnovib.nl)
Oxfam New Zealand (www.oxfam.org.nz)
Oxfam Quebec (www.oxfam.qc.ca)