Poor People’s Organizations

One of the most important and most overlooked development assets is the capacity of poor people to mobilize and organize for collective action. Membership-based organizations and networks of poor people have emerged in many places in response to the common needs of specific groups: rural producers, home-based workers, slum dwellers, indigenous people, and landless workers, among others. Poor people’s exclusion from decision making at the local, national, and global levels, especially in the face of rapid changes brought about by globalization, gives impetus to the formation of these organizations and to their efforts to make their voices heard. When successful, such groups have been able to effectively represent their members in local and even national forums. Some have then reached out to similar groups in other countries, recognizing both the power of numbers and the commonality of problems poor people face.

This note begins with a description of the World Bank’s experience with rural producers organizations (RPOs). It then describes some successes and good practices of these and other poor people’s organizations in three major areas:

- Development of processing, marketing, and alternative employment;
- Management of collective goods;
- Networking and coalition building for influencing decision making.

The emergence of vibrant, representative poor people’s organizations such as those described below is enabling poor people to connect with and influence national and global actors.

World Bank Experience with Rural Producers Organizations

Seventy percent of the world’s poor live in rural areas, where agriculture or agriculture-related activities are the mainstay of their livelihoods. The rural poor have limited access to services or means of production, and limited weight, if any, in local, national, or global decision-making processes. To lift themselves out of poverty and improve their livelihoods, rural producers around the world have organized themselves into rural producers organizations. RPOs are key actors for any development strategy aimed at reaching the rural poor.

A 1993 review of the World Bank’s role in the development of cooperatives and rural organizations concluded that inappropriate policy frameworks and government interference were the major reasons that many cooperatives failed to develop as viable and efficient organizations. This was true despite significant investments of financial resources and technical support from donors. Projects with rural producers organizations were negotiated
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exclusively between the Bank and governments. They failed to analyze institutional issues, were overly complex, and provided very limited capacity building, most of it for government services. The review concluded that cooperatives must be seen as private sector enterprises and that government’s primary role should be not only to control or regulate, but also to establish a conducive policy environment for their growth.

In June 1999, the Bank organized a consultative workshop to hear the views of RPO representatives and NGOs providing support to RPOs. The goal was to better understand why supporting RPOs is important, what types and activities of RPOs should be strengthened, how RPOs could be supported, and what the role of the World Bank should be. In addition, as part of the process of revising its Rural Development Strategy, the Bank commissioned a study to identify the potential role of RPOs in its future rural development strategy.

The findings from both the workshop and the study emphasize that RPOs are not only key economic actors, but also vehicles for the empowerment of rural people and for their inclusion in policy dialogues at the local, national, and global levels. Partnership with rural development actors and the private sector—including RPOs—is necessary to achieve rural development, but it is a fledgling process that requires long-term support. Some areas for programmatic emphasis include the following:

1) **Promoting a conducive environment**
   a) Promote a conducive legal environment in which private initiatives (collective and individual) are supported by appropriate legislation that is effectively enforced.
   b) Promote effective decentralization that provides a favorable environment for RPOs to generate locally relevant answers to their needs.
   c) Promote decentralized rural finance institutions.
   d) Promote institutional reforms in the delivery of public services to ensure client-responsive services and accountability to users.
   e) Strengthen the capabilities of service providers.
   f) Promote a dialogue among donor agencies to harmonize approaches and procedures in support to RPOs.

2) **Empowerment of rural producers organizations**
   a) Promote the establishment of forums for RPOs at the local, regional, and national levels (when they do not already exist), where rural producers can meet, establish their priorities, and exchange experiences.
   b) Finance a regional and national RPO capacity-building fund, in which allocation decisions are made by RPOs themselves.
   c) Finance “professional facilitators” to help RPOs organize themselves and help them define transparent procedures to allocate resources and operate their forum.
   d) Obtain recognition of RPOs from governments and end the mistrust directed toward them by public services.
   e) Ensure that RPOs are recognized as partners by governments and donors, and that they actively participate in:
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- preparation and negotiations of rural development policy or strategy (CAS, PRSPs, etc.);
- preparation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of rural development projects.

Activities of Poor People’s Organizations: Selected Examples

Development of Processing, Marketing, and Alternative Employment

Poor people’s organizations have the potential to play important roles in improving and expanding access to markets and opportunities. Among other services, they can coordinate production activities of rural producers and workers in the informal sector, provide marketing and/or advocacy services, and execute capital-intensive investments in infrastructure or processing equipment.

Dairy cooperatives in India

Dairy cooperative development in India began in Gujarat with the establishment of the milk company AMUL in 1946 in response to limited opportunities for traditional milk producers. Operation Flood built on this experience when formation of cooperatives became a government priority for agricultural development in the 1970s. Beginning in 1974 with three projects in Karnataka, Rajasthan, and Madhya Pradesh, and following with two national dairy projects funded through the late 1980s, the World Bank lent over $500 million to develop the milk industry through cooperatives (made up of district unions combined into state federations). The projects have focused on capacity building (strengthening cooperative institutional structures and training) and support to activities and infrastructure development for increasing production and marketing. The overall objective was to promote viable cooperative businesses, owned and managed by producers, for collecting and marketing milk products in order to expand rural incomes and improve dairy productivity.

The national federation comprises 70,000 village milk cooperatives with some 9 million members. Sixty percent of milk suppliers are landless, small, or marginal farmers. The federation and its members produce 13 million liters of milk daily, generating an annual additional income of $90 for each family. Per capita milk consumption has almost doubled, and the milk cooperative business created an estimated 250,000 off-farm jobs, most of them in rural areas.

Investment has been heavy, and some observers have been concerned about the cooperative being overprotective and monopolistic; there are also concerns that it could use its political power inappropriately. However, these problems seem to be heavily outweighed by the impressive results of the program, due largely to committed membership and farmer-controlled organizations at the local level, sound management, influential and charismatic leaders, strong accounting systems, and effective and profitable services provided to members.
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Vila Paraná, Brazil

Vila Paraná is one of 22 communities settled in 1973 through the Projeto de Colonização of Serra do Mel, in the northwestern part of the state of Rio Grande do Norte in Brazil. Attracted by a variety of incentives offered by the state government, 1,196 families received individual plots of 50 hectares each, of which 15 hectares were already planted with cashew nut trees. Since then, much development has taken place in Serra do Mel. Cashew nut plantations occupy a total area of 25,000 hectares, with annual production of unprocessed cashew nuts as high as 10,000 tons.

In the late 1980s, farmers in Serra do Mel began to process cashew nuts using small, semi-artisanal family units developed with the help of the Associação de Apoio às Comunidades do Campo (AACC), one of the most active NGOs in Rio Grande do Norte. These individual family units had difficulty competing in the market. At the end of 1998, the association representing the 46 families of Vila Paraná presented a request, through the local FUMAC council, for a subproject to set up a larger cashew nut processing and marketing center (central) for the community. The proposal was approved and financed by the World Bank-supported Rural Poverty Alleviation Program, at a cost of R$15,400. Individual producers now take their cashews for further processing, grading, and marketing in the central, selling their processed cashew nuts at an average price of R$9.20 per kilogram, compared to the R$7.50 per kilogram received previously from intermediaries.

The central employs 25 people from the community, 19 of them women. Each receives a monthly salary which is 13 percent higher than the minimum wage in Brazil. When asked if local intermediaries can still buy unprocessed cashew nuts in the area, the president of the association replied: “Maybe elsewhere than Vila Paraná, because here no producer sells his cashew nuts outside the central anymore.” In January 2000, Dutch businessmen visited Vila Paraná and, recognizing the high quality of the cashew nuts produced in the central, initiated contractual arrangements that will allow the association to export its production to Europe.

Self-Employed Women’s Association (SEWA), India

In December 1971, Ela Bhatt, a lawyer and social activist who was then head of the women’s wing of the Textile Labor Association (TLA), along with Arvind Buch, president of the TLA, founded SEWA in Ahmedabad, India. In April 1972 SEWA was registered as a trade union, making it the first trade union to address the needs of poor women workers in the informal sector, working at home, or trading and vending in the streets. Any self-employed female worker in India can become a member of SEWA by paying an annual membership fee of 5 rupees (about 12 cents). Every three years SEWA members elect representatives to a new trade council made up of worker-leaders, and this committee then elects the executive committee.
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SEWA has 212,000 members across India, with 84 cooperatives, 181 producers groups, 1,000 savings groups in nine districts of Gujarat, and about 100,000 women depositors in the SEWA Bank. About 30,000 poor women participate annually in the SEWA Academy, where they explore their contribution to the national economy, their roles and responsibilities as women, their own organizations, and the values and vision behind their movement. SEWA also has a “barefoot managers” training program, and health and life insurance programs. On behalf of its members it has won high court rulings to improve work conditions of urban vendors. SEWA is exploring options to access large loans and venture capital to finance its insurance, information technology, and banking activities. Based on its 20 years of experience, SEWA has reached out across national boundaries and actively participated in the emergence of cross-country networks of common interest.

**Management of Collective Goods**

It has recently been acknowledged that people whose livelihoods depend on the sustainable management of collective goods are most motivated to manage them, and if formally organized, have the capabilities to do so adequately. Impressive cases exist in which governments have adopted new policies to transfer management of irrigation schemes or other collective resources to farmers groups, resulting in notable improvements in the sustainability of those resources. In urban areas, it has been found that slum dwellers organizing and pooling their resources can bring about collective ownership of property and more secure land tenure.  

**Water users associations in Albania**

Following the breakup of state farms and cooperatives in Albania, and the subsequent privatization of the agricultural sector, there was no organization to take over the operation of irrigation systems and the distribution of water. The formation of water users associations (WUA) began under the World Bank–financed Irrigation Rehabilitation Project in 1994. The first WUAs were organized by village unit, but since several villages might share a single source of water, they were reorganized on the basis of water source to avoid disputes. WUA members are full-time farmers who grow wheat, vegetables, alfalfa, and maize.

The state-run water enterprises, which operated the primary and secondary levels of the irrigation systems, had become overstaffed and inefficient; farmers lost confidence in them and were reluctant to pay water charges. The idea of allowing WUAs to manage the overall irrigation systems evolved as a solution to this problem. The WUAs became responsible for all costs involved in operating the system, and paid reduced charges to the water enterprises according to their level of responsibility.

Although it started only in 1994, the program has had considerable success. By 1997 there were 187 WUAs covering the entire project area of 98,000 irrigated hectares. By 2001 408 water user associations had grouped into 21 federations covering 200,000 families, or one-third of the entire population. The associations are self-financing and manage entire irrigation schemes; they have
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improved delivery of water to those at the end of irrigation schemes and increased cost recovery from zero in 1994 to $700,000 in 2000.

**Hill community forestry in Nepal**

In 1978 the government of Nepal passed legislation handing a substantial amount of public forest land and hilly areas over to local communities. Local management of both public and locally owned forest was to be achieved through the *panchayats* (villages), under agreed forest management plans. The *panchayats*, however, proved ill suited to undertake local forest management. Although forest management committees were formed, they seldom functioned as representative discussion and decision-making bodies. The system was revised to incorporate features of the indigenous control and management systems traditionally practiced by many communities. These systems were based on user groups rather than on whole communities. These groups established management rules that were enforced by use of forest watchers, and included social sanctions.

The focus on user groups was formalized, with more authority and responsibility progressively devolving to these groups under Nepal’s 1993 Forest Act. Ownership of the land remains with the state but trees legally belong to the user groups. Management control rests solely with the users of the resources, who develop their own operational plans, set the prices at which the produce is sold, and determine how surplus income will be spent. By June 1997 there were 6,000 user groups, managing 450,000 hectares, with another 6,000 waiting for formal registration.

Issues still arise within user groups, between them, and with the forest department; some of these issues have to do with difficulties securing access to forest areas from officials, domination by local elites, politicization, and pressures from the forest department. Nevertheless, the Nepal experience has been encouraging: recent studies have demonstrated that managed forests have often thrived with active user group management.

**Regional producer groups in Burkina Faso**

The World Bank is piloting an RPO capacity-building program in Burkina Faso as a component of the National Agricultural Services Development Project II (PNDSA II). The project, approved in 1997 with a World Bank commitment of $47.3 million over six years, is using a community-driven development approach in nine pilot provinces (out of 45) to encourage RPOs in each province to form a regional forum of RPOs. Within these forums, RPOs carry out several activities, including: (a) exchange experiences and discuss common issues or problems; (b) set up priorities for productive investment or services; and (c) select capacity-building subprojects identified and prepared by RPOs, to be financed on a cost-sharing basis. Projects accepted by the regional RPO forum are implemented by the RPOs that prepared them, with funds transferred directly to them. They may contract with service providers of their choice when necessary. Members of the RPO forum are RPO leaders, selected by their peers.
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In order to benefit from project support, local RPOs need legal status and a bank account. The PNDSAI1 supported efforts by the Ministry of Agriculture to: (a) revise the existing laws relating to cooperatives and local groupements so that these traditional farmers’ groups could be registered as legal entities; (b) translate information on the new law into local languages and disseminate it; and (c) facilitate the registration of RPOs.

**Implementation and roles.** Responsibilities are distributed as follows. *Local RPOs* prepare capacity-building subproject proposals on the theme of their choice, selecting one of the following instruments: training, advisory services, communication, participation in a national or international RPO meeting, small productive investments, or on-farm R&D. They then submit these proposals to the RPO regional forum. If a proposal is accepted, the local RPO implements the subproject activities on the basis of a contract between the project management unit and the RPO (see below), and reports implementation progress to the RPO provincial forum.

The *RPO provincial forum* adapts the proposed procurement and disbursement manual; organizes sessions to discuss RPOs’ priorities, exchange experiences, and review and select proposals made by RPOs; and monitors implementation of financed subproject proposals.

A *professional facilitator* (NGO) has been recruited to help RPOs form regional forums. Its functions include: (a) local diffusion of information regarding the project, its objectives, the procurement and disbursement mechanisms, and total amount of funds available for RPOs per zone; (b) facilitation to help RPOs select their representatives at the local and provincial levels; (c) elaboration of governing rules for the provincial forum; (d) revision/adaptation of a simplified procurement and disbursement manual with RPOs leaders; (e) training RPO leaders and members of the regional and local forums in their functions regarding the review and selection of subprojects, and subsequent monitoring; (d) monitoring the process; and (f) drawing lessons.

Subproject proposals selected by RPO regional forums are sent to a national financial management unit. Documents include the subproject proposal, the approval from the RPO regional forum, and the RPO’s bank account statement. On the basis of the documentation received, the national financial unit prepares a contract with the RPO and transfers funds according to the contract. The financial unit also organizes technical and financial audits of financed subprojects on a random basis.

**Summary of results after two years of implementation.**

- Of the 4,009 local RPOs eligible, 1,480 of them submitted a subproject, and the regional forum selected 908 of these.
- The project financial management unit signed 201 contracts and transferred an estimated $351,000 to 201 RPOs (an average of $1,700/project/RPO). RPOs contributed up to 20 percent of the total costs of subprojects.
- The Bank and the national financial management unit cannot keep up with the pace of project proposals. A total of 707 RPO subproject proposals, for an estimated amount of $1.2 million, are awaiting contracts and initial disbursement. The national financial management unit cannot disburse funds quickly enough due to administrative problems within the Bank and national administrations.
**Scaling up.** RPOs in Burkina Faso have demonstrated their capacity to identify and formulate subproject proposals, select service providers, and implement their subprojects. The Burkina Faso government and the donor community have decided to expand this approach to the whole country. The same approach has also been tested in Senegal with similar results.

**RPOs Influencing Public Policy Decision Making**

In many different settings, poor people’s organizations are forming networks and coalitions to present a united front and strengthen their influence and bargaining positions in decision making at the local, national, and global levels.

**The National Rural Exchange and Cooperation Council (CNCR), Senegal**

In March 1993, nine national federations of rural producers in Senegal joined to create CNCR, with the goal of representing rural producers in any formal negotiations related to rural development. By 2001 CNCR had grown to include 19 national rural producers organizations, representing 3 million rural producers in all regions of Senegal. CNCR is recognized by the government of Senegal as a legitimate institution representing rural producers and can speak in their names. Its activities, driven by the idea that rural people are responsible for their own destiny, center on three objectives:

- To promote dialogue and exchange of experiences among the leaders of farmers organizations in order to strengthen the farmers movement and its federations.
- To represent farmers’ interests in negotiations with the government or other national or international partners.
- To contribute to the promotion and sustainable development of family farming.

CNCR is actively involved in rural development policy making, holding regular meetings with the president of Senegal (once a year), with the prime minister (once every three months), and with the minister of agriculture (once a month). The group is also involved in designing, implementing, and monitoring several World Bank and other non-Bank-funded projects, including the National Rural Investment Project and the Agricultural Services and Producer Organizations Project.

CNCR’s successes show that negotiations between national policy bodies and representatives of poor people’s interests can have a significant impact on ensuring the promotion of policies favorable to people at the local level. For example, in 1994, as the credit borrowing rate varied between 13.5 percent and 17.5 percent in rural areas in Senegal, CNCR discussed with the national rural credit bank (La Caisse Nationale de Credit Agricole) and the Senegalese government the difficulties these high interest rates were causing for Senegalese farmers. As a result, in 1995 the interest rate for farmers was reduced to 7.5 percent. Also in 1995, CNCR raised the issue of the low productivity of soil in Senegal with the Ministry of Agriculture. An agreement was reached by which the government arranged for the systematic provision of free rock phosphate (a slow-release fertilizer) to farmers and their organizations, greatly improving soil productivity. In return, farmers groups agreed to arrange for the distribution of the fertilizer to rural areas across the country.
Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Centres (SPARC)/ Shack/Slum Dwellers International (SDI)

Formed in Mumbai, India, in 1984 by Sheela Patel, SPARC works to form partnerships between professionals committed to grassroots activism and communities of pavement dwellers. It provides support to Mahila Milan, a network of women’s collectives initially formed by women pavement dwellers, and to the National Slum Dwellers Federation, a network of leaders from urban slum settlements. Working with communities in 36 cities across India, SPARC is actively involved in regional and international networks of slum dwellers associations and participates in a global campaign for secure tenure for poor city dwellers. SPARC’s aim is to support the organization of communities and create physical, social, and emotional space for communities to pool their resources, learn from each other, and take action on their collective concerns.

SPARC has educated and trained pavement dwellers—mostly women with children—to collectively avert or deal with demolition or eviction, helping to break isolation and create solidarity. Through SPARC’s intervention, 600 families living on the pavement in Mumbai have been encouraged to save an average of 5,000 rupees for future permanent housing. In addition, 600 families have saved 1.6 million rupees in a savings fund that they use in times of crisis. About 1,800 people have received loans.

SPARC programs help poor people advocate changes in policies, obtain land, design and construct homes, and manage their settlements. The alliance has convinced the government to provide alternative land for slum dwellers and to stop mass demolitions of slums without notice. It has demonstrated new models of urban upgrading in World Bank–financed projects, including resettlement of slum dwellers living directly next to railway lines.

On a regional and global scale, SPARC is a lead member of Shack/Slum Dwellers International (SDI). This global network of national slum dweller federations from 12 countries works to strengthen grassroots efforts against homelessness and negotiates with governments. SDI member federations support grassroots savings and credit schemes that bring poor people together to challenge the structures of poverty.

Key to SDI’s success is exchange visits of slum and shack dwellers to other villages, towns, and countries to share their experiences and ideas with people in similar situations but often different contexts. African savings schemes were kick-started by one such exchange between South Africa and India in 1991 and 1992. In South Africa, the South Africa Homeless People’s Federation has mobilized over 60,000 federation members to save regularly, amassing the equivalent of over $1.7 million. The model has spread to Zimbabwe, where more than 17,000 people are saving, and to Namibia, where over 6,000 people are saving. In addition to knowledge sharing and learning, SDI also supports action by local members across countries. For example, an organized international solidarity effort led by SDI successfully supported local efforts to prevent demolition if slums located directly next to railway lines in Mumbai, India, in February 2000.
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Via Campesina
This international movement, whose name means “the peasant way,” is based in Honduras and coordinates more than 50 peasant organizations of small and middle-scale producers, agricultural workers, rural women, and indigenous communities from Asia, Africa, the Americas, and Europe. Its objective is to develop solidarity and unity in diversity among organizations of small farmers in pursuit of economic and social justice. It also aims to strengthen women’s participation in formulating proposals to improve livelihoods.

The organization began in April 1992 when several peasant leaders from Central America, North America, and Europe gathered in Managua, Nicaragua, at the Congress of the National Union of Farmers and Livestock Owners. In 1999 Via Campesina launched its Global Campaign for Agrarian Reform. In Toledo, the Philippines, peasant families had started to benefit from agrarian reform by receiving land previously belonging to a huge estate. But armed struggle with the landlords, who had tried to get their land back, resulted in the burning of some peasant houses, eviction of peasants, and killings of members of peasant organizations. An international campaign in support of the Toledo families was mounted through hundreds of letters sent to the Philippine Ministry for Agrarian Reform. Confronted with this international pressure, officials forced the landlords to turn over the land to the peasants.

Another global action by Via Campesina is the International Solidarity and Resistance Caravan. More than 450 farmers from India, Brazil, and Europe came together in 1999 in an international caravan that made its way through 12 European countries. The purpose was to confront the most powerful countries of the world to demand a new framework for international economic relations, one in which the world’s wealth would not be concentrated in a small group of transnational corporations. Via Campesina has also been a major mobilizer against the World Trade Organization. In Seattle in 2000 members from several continents protested against transnational companies and announced their decision to fight genetically modified food.

The International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP)
Founded in 1946, the International Federation of Agricultural Producers is an international organization grouping nationally representative general farmers organizations from around the world. IFAP has nearly 80 member organizations in 52 countries and 42 associate members in 30 countries. It represents all of the agricultural producers in the industrialized world and hundreds of millions of farmers in developing countries, and is financed and governed entirely by its member organizations.

Established to bring about cooperation between organizations of agricultural producers, with a view to ensuring the security of the world’s food supply, IFAP also works to improve the economic and social status of all who live by and on the land, and to promote the creation and strengthening of independent farmers organizations in every country. In pursuit of these objectives, IFAP:
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• Acts as a forum in which leaders of national farmers organizations can meet to exchange information and ideas, highlight mutual interests, and take coordinated action to further those interests. IFAP has five permanent standing committees on agriculture in developing countries, representing Africa, Asia, the Mediterranean, North and South America, and Central America/Andean region/Caribbean.
• Keeps members informed about international events and issues of concern to farmers organizations.
• Promotes the creation and strengthening of independent, representative organizations of agricultural producers around the world through such tools as the Corporate Development Committee, which supports the development of organizational capacity among poor people’s rural organizations in developing countries.
• Acts as the recognized representative of the world’s farmers, bringing the concerns of agricultural producers to the attention of international meetings of governments and other bodies, including the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the World Trade Organization, and the World Bank.

IFAP’s influence has been taken into account in many international conferences. During the 1995 U.N. World Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen, for example, as a result of IFAP’s efforts, the world’s governments recognized farmers organizations as an essential element of civil society. At the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, IFAP presented a declaration in which the world’s farmers committed themselves to environmental conservation. According to a German farmers organization, this declaration had an important impact not only on the international bodies involved with IFAP, but also on national governments. “In Germany, we referred strongly to this resolution in order to influence national politics and to prove to our government that German farmers shared the same point of view as other farmers worldwide.”

IFAP has also worked since 1989 to strengthen the links between farmers organizations and research institutes, organizing a series of consultations that resulted in the farmers’ real needs being considered in research programs. Since then, projects linking farmers organizations and research institutes have been implemented in Burkina Faso, Kenya, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

Resources


