PROJECT

LAND AT SCALE EGYPT

FROM FRAGMENTATION TO COLLABORATION: Lessons from Land Use Consolidation in Upper Egypt



KIT INSTITUTE

german cooperation
DEUTSCHE ZUSAMMENARBEIT

implemented by giz

Switzerland.

Rijksdienst voor Ondernemend Nederland

AT A GLANCE

Context: Land fragmentation through inheritance is the core constraint on smallholder agriculture in Upper Egypt. The LUC model enables farmers to coordinate fragmented plots as a single productive unit, without transferring land ownership.

What was done: GIZ launched the participatory LUC project in June 2024 in Minya, Assiut, and Beni Suef under the AIP/MALR framework. AIP is co-financed by Germany, Switzerland, and the Netherlands. The co-finance of the Netherlands through LAND-at-Scale focuses on LUC. More than 20 groups were formed. This brief draws on a KIT-facilitated workshop and writeshop, and a survey of 58 farmers (April 2026).

Key findings: Production increased consistently across participating groups. Social cohesion improved markedly. A women-only group in Assiut achieved 50% increase in soybean yields than non-adopters. Yet market linkages and access to collective finance remain critical unresolved gaps.

Core message: Trust, voluntary design, and embedded local institutions are not peripheral features of the model — they are the model. Where these were present, results followed. Where they were absent, gains remained fragile.

20 LUC groups formed	**36/58** farmers reported income gains
50% increase in yield reported by Assiut women's group	**3** governorates: Minya, Assiut, Beni Suef

1. Context: Egypt's Land Challenge and the LUC Response

In the Nile Valley, land ownership is generally private and socially recognised, the problem is not insecurity of tenure, but structural inefficiency in land use. Decades of inheritance-driven subdivision have produced plots too small and dispersed for efficient cultivation. Mechanisation becomes economically unviable, irrigation scheduling fragmented, and bargaining power with traders and input suppliers negligible. Women, despite formal inheritance rights, face additional barriers to accessing machinery, credit, and farmer networks.



Land fragmentation in Upper Egypt.

The LUC model responds not by altering ownership, but by coordinating use. Through voluntary agreements, neighbouring farmers consolidate their fragmented plots into a single operational unit, planting, irrigating, procuring, and selling together. This sidesteps the legal risks of compulsory land consolidation while capturing economies of scale. The model's transferability, however, depends on a specific mix of conditions: secure tenure, high fragmentation, and farmer willingness to cooperate.

The project operates in Minya, Assiut, and Beni Suef under Egypt's Agricultural Innovation Project (AIP) of the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MALR), co-financed through the LAND-at-Scale programme. **It is midway through implementation**, this brief is a learning document, not a final evaluation.

2. What Was Built — the Model and Its Logic

Building collective action through trust

In communities where land is tied to dignity and inheritance, "consolidation" carries risk. Facilitators therefore entered not to present a model but to co-build one: visiting communities repeatedly to listen, understand what had failed before, and introduce consolidation gradually as a response to problems farmers named themselves. Only after that process of dialogue did groups begin to form.

At the centre of each group sits a binding contract, although not a legally binding contract, the tailor-made contract is signed by all members of the group and agrees to work consolidated for 3 years. In Upper Egypt, a written commitment carries significant social weight, it transforms a shared interest into a mutual accountability. Roughly one third of initially interested farmers stepped back at the contract stage, not because the model was unclear, but because trust between them was not yet sufficient. This was treated as a meaningful signal, not a failure. A distinctive feature of the AIP approach is the establishment of a formal governance structure within each group. Members elect a chairman, a treasurer, and three to five committees responsible for procurement, marketing, agricultural practices, and crisis response. Unlike many LUC approaches that focus primarily on technical or production aspects, this governance model strengthens ownership, accountability, and the long-term sustainability of collective action.



Farmer Field School session supporting Land Use Consolidation (LUC) groups in Upper Egypt.

> *"There is no conflict because of the contract signed and the defined roles and responsibilities."*
> **— Multiple survey respondents, Minya groups**

From consolidated production to market integration

Farmer Field Schools (FFS) built technical knowledge and the habit of shared decision-making in parallel. Climate-smart practices, raised beds, intercropping, crop rotation, were introduced sequentially to groups that had already demonstrated cohesion. Farmer Organisations (FOs[1]) served as the institutional backbone: selected for strengthening across all

[1] Farmers Organisation (FOs) refers to Community development associations (CDAs) or agriculture co-operatives whom are involved with small farmers.

three governorates because sustainable market integration requires a locally embedded actor to hold relationships, mediate between parties, and maintain accountability over time.

On the market side, the programme worked on two tracks: structured matchmaking with agricultural export councils to communicate private sector demand requirements directly to organised groups, and digital platforms to sustain those connections beyond the event cycle. The model depends on FOs being genuinely trusted and locally embedded, FFS building not just agronomic but governance capacity, and digital and financial literacy enabling farmers to navigate systems independently.

3. What Changed — Results and Key Insights

Production and Income

Across all groups participating in more than one agricultural cycle, production increased consistently. 36 of 58 surveyed farmers reported measurable income gains, partly offset by input price inflation. The LUC model's main mechanism is cost reduction: collective harvesting often eliminates hired labour entirely, a single tractor now serves an entire group, and bulk input purchasing through platforms like AgriCash secures lower prices from the start of each cycle. Solar-powered irrigation stations (such as the Isra group's 20KW installation) cut diesel dependency significantly.

> *"With cooperation we reached the highest price, a lower price of seeds, and selling at a higher price, saving time and effort."*
> **— Fatheya Sallam, Luka's Ladies Group, Assiut**

Social and Relational Outcomes

Irrigation and boundary disputes, historically the dominant source of conflict between neighbors, have been resolved in virtually every group surveyed. FO leaders report spending significantly less time mediating disputes, redirecting effort toward broader community development. Farmers describe a shift from individualistic competition to "family-like" cooperation. The model has also proved inclusive of participants with disabilities and has begun reversing rural out-migration, with sons returning to family farms as agriculture becomes more viable.

Women's Group: Evidence of Structural Change

A 21-woman group in Assiut, working 4.5 feddans, stands as the project's most striking example of what the model can unlock. Initially facing criticism from in-laws and neighbours, they used collective presence as a safety mechanism to normalise their fieldwork. Results overtook resistance: soybean yields increased by 50% higher than those of neighboring non-adopters, selling at 2,100 instead of the market rate of 1,800 Egyptian pounds per unit — a 17% premium. The group established a Village Savings and Loan Association (VSLA) to pool production funds, shared technical knowledge with relatives and neighbours, and, when two members left at the start of a season, welcomed them back at the end after the season's success became impossible to ignore.



Women farmers participating in Land Use Consolidation activities in Assiut.

WHAT FARMERS STILL NEED

Despite these gains, three structural gaps persist. First, **market access**: most groups still depend on local traders and lack formal contract farming arrangements. Second, **collective finance**: LUC groups are not yet legal entities recognised by banks and cannot access collective loans, limiting investment in technology without ongoing project subsidies. A third gap concerns **women's formal inclusion**: LUC contracts are bound to land titles, which are predominantly held by men — women working land informally as widows or renters often remain outside the group's governance structure.

4. WHAT DID NOT WORK — HONEST LESSONS FROM IMPLEMENTATION

A critical reflection on implementation challenges strengthens, rather than diminishes, the analytical value of this brief. The following four areas limited the model's effectiveness and point toward what future interventions need to address.



Participants collaborating during the LUC learning workshop and knowledge exchange session.

1. GROUP FORMATION AND SUSTAINABILITY

Several groups either did not form successfully or fractured once external facilitation decreased. Externally driven group creation, often tied to project timelines, produced structures lacking internal cohesion. In contexts where individual decision-making has been the norm for generations, collective action introduces real perceived risk, especially for smallholders with limited buffers against failure.

> **LESSON: Social capital first.**
>
> Group formation is a social process, not a procedural step. It requires pre-existing relationships, shared economic interests, and gradual trust-building - not acceleration to meet project deliverables. Externally imposed timelines are one of the model's main fragility risks.

2. THE MARKETING GAP

While significant progress was made in production and collective action, sustainable market integration remains a longer-term process. Without formal contracts, structured aggregation, or stable buyer relationships, smallholders continue to operate at a structural disadvantage in broader value chains.



Farmer Organisations and private sector representatives participating in a business matchmaking session under the Tamayoz Programme.

LESSON: Design for the full value chain from day one.

Agricultural interventions need to integrate market access, contract farming, and buyer relationships from initial design - not as secondary add-ons. Aggregation systems, pricing mechanisms, and commercial linkages must be built in parallel with production improvements.

3. Women's inclusion, structural barriers beyond participation

Despite the Assiut group's success, broader women's inclusion remained partial. The dual burden, new agricultural responsibilities without reduction in domestic workload, limited participation. Women's involvement in production rarely translated into decision-making power or resource control. Social norms restricting mobility meant even irrigation tasks required group-based workarounds. And because LUC contracts are tied to land titles predominantly held by men, women working land informally are structurally excluded from group governance.

LESSON: Inclusion requires power shifts, not just participation.

Women's inclusion demands intentional strategies that address power dynamics within households and communities - not just access to training. Without mechanisms that genuinely strengthen women's control over resources and decision-making, inclusion risks being participation in name only.

4. The scale-up bottleneck

Scaling successful pilots encountered persistent constraints: limited capacity of farmers and intermediaries to engage in formal contractual arrangements, weak enforcement mechanisms, and insufficient institutional alignment between public agencies, private sector actors, and financial institutions. Local successes were often dependent on specific leadership dynamics and contextual conditions that may not easily replicate elsewhere.

LESSON: Scaling is a different process, not a bigger pilot.

Moving from pilot to scale requires robust institutional frameworks, clear contractual systems, and capacity building across all value chain actors - including policy, regulatory, and financial dimensions. A model that works in one community is not automatically scalable without this architecture.

5. Five Lessons for Sustainability

The transition from a GIZ-supported pilot to a self-sustaining community practice requires more than successful harvests. It requires the endurance of the institutional and social architecture that allows farmers to act collectively. Five core lessons

define the minimum viable conditions for the model to survive after external support ends.



Lesson 1 — Trust is the infrastructure, not the background

Trust between farmers, between farmers and FOs, and eventually between groups and private buyers is the functional infrastructure without which the system fails. It is built through consistency of presence, transparency, and delivered commitments, and lost through unmanaged expectations. The binding written contract is not a bureaucratic hurdle; it is the primary trust instrument. For sustainability, this trust must be maintained through local intermediaries who hold legitimacy long after the project ends.

Lesson 2 — Voluntary, participatory design is a sustainability mechanism

The resilience of a group depends on whether members *chose* to join through collective decision, not invitation. "Voluntary" in this model means no mandated crops, no free input handouts that create dependency, and no top-down directives. Providing training and knowledge before any commitment is required ensures that a signed contract represents informed ownership, not compliance.

Lesson 3 — FOs and extension services are determinants of success, not delivery channels

Where FOs demonstrated local embeddedness, transparency, and active engagement, they produced stronger local ownership and continuity. Their effectiveness depended not on technical expertise alone, but on responsiveness and long-term presence. FOs should be understood as long-term institutional actors essential for sustaining collective action, market integration, and inclusive rural development, not as project intermediaries that step back when the project ends.

Lesson 4 — Capacity building must be multidimensional and accompanied

Sustainability requires capacities well beyond agronomic knowledge: contractual literacy, financial planning, digital literacy, and negotiation with market actors. These are built through accompanied practice, FFS, field demonstrations, mentoring, not through one-off training delivery. In several cases, farmers had sufficient technical understanding but lacked the financial resources to apply it. Knowledge and enabling conditions must develop together.

Lesson 5 — Sustained participation requires visible economic returns

Collective structures and new practices were maintained where they produced clear economic benefits — lower costs, better prices, reduced risk. Technology adoption (e.g., solar irrigation) was strongest where farmers could directly perceive short-term value. Market access and long-term contractual arrangements are therefore not optional extras; they are what makes the model worth participating in beyond the first season.

6. What We Don't Yet Know

This brief is published at the midpoint of the project. Several critical questions remain open and will shape the next phase of learning:

- **Group resilience without support:** To what extent will collective action mechanisms hold once external facilitation and funding are fully withdrawn?
- **Long-term commercial sustainability:** Can contractual arrangements between farmers and private buyers be sustained under changing market conditions?
- **Women's empowerment depth:** Can women's participation in production translate into meaningful resource control and decision-making authority?
- **Replicability across contexts:** How do results differ across Minya, Assiut, and Beni Suef, and what does this imply for adaptation elsewhere?
- **Technology sustainability:** Will solar irrigation systems and digital tools remain functional without ongoing technical and financial support?

7. Recommendations

The following recommendations are drawn from implementation experience and addressed to four distinct audiences.

For	Recommendation
GIZ / AIP Programme Design	• Institutionalise trust-building as a dedicated programme component — not a by-product of technical activities. • Integrate market access and value chain partnerships from the outset; engage buyers early in programme design. • Strengthen FOs as long-term institutional actors, not project intermediaries. • Adopt longer implementation timelines and sustained field presence to allow trust to develop organically. • Promote written agreements and transparent benefit-sharing mechanisms across all stakeholder relationships.
Donors and Funding Partners	• Adopt longer funding horizons that allow time for relationship-building and institutional development. • Support sustainability-focused components: extension services, FO capacity, and post-project accompaniment. • Fund integrated programme design linking production, land governance, gender, market access, and climate resilience. • Reduce economic risks during transition periods by facilitating access to inputs, finance, and collective investment.

For	Recommendation
MALR and Government	• Develop policy and regulatory frameworks that formally support voluntary LUC mechanisms. • Invest in extension service staffing, technical capacity, and farmer outreach. • Introduce gender-responsive policies strengthening women's access to extension, land rights, and decision-making. • Support FOs as long-term institutional actors for collective action and market integration.
Other Development Actors	• Build on existing local relationships and trusted institutions rather than creating parallel systems. • Treat sustainability as a social and institutional process — not only a technical outcome. • Document and share implementation failures alongside successes to strengthen collective learning. • Explore forward contracting models to support durable FO-private sector partnerships.

Closing



Stakeholders participating in the LUC learning workshop held under the LAND-at-Scale Programme.

The Egypt experience demonstrates that meaningful land governance change is possible without altering legal rights or triggering political resistance. The LUC model works, where trust, voluntary design, embedded institutions, and economic incentives are in place. Where they are absent, gains remain fragile.

The results in this brief are real and, in some cases, remarkable. But the path from pilot to scale is still being mapped. What this document offers is an honest account of what has been built, what it has produced, and what conditions are needed to make it last, for the project team, for government partners, and for any organisation working on similar challenges elsewhere.

Abbreviations

AIP	Agricultural Innovation Project
FFS	Farmer Field School
FO/FOs	Farmer Organisation / Farmer Organisations (FOs refer to Community Development Associations or agricultural cooperatives).
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (German Development Agency)
KIT	KIT Institute
LAS	LAND-at-Scale (programme)
LUC	Land Use Consolidation
MALR	Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (Egypt)
RVO	Netherlands Enterprise Agency (Rijksdienst voor Ondernemend Nederland)
VSLA	Village Savings and Loan Association

Authors: Ahmed Maher, Hassan Elbadawy, Yasmeen Fahmy and Lisa Hildeman (GIZ); and Sandra Quintero (KIT Institute).

Learning Brief: GIZ Egypt & KIT Institute, LAND-at-Scale Programme

June 2026

Cover photo: *Women farmers participating in Land Use Consolidation activities in Assiut, Upper Egypt*

Implemented in partnership with:

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands

Netherlands Enterprise Agency

Please cite as: Maher, A., Elbadawy, H., Fahmy, Y., Hildeman, L. and Quintero, S. (2026). From Fragmentation to Collaboration: Lessons from Land Use Consolidation in Upper Egypt. Learning Brief, LAND-at-Scale Programme. GIZ Egypt and KIT Institute.

This publication was developed as part of the LAND-at-scale programme, funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and managed by the Netherlands Agency for Business and Development (RVO). The views presented in this document are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent those of the Dutch government.

© LAND-at-scale 2026. This work was created under the License of Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0).