



Agricultural and Food Security Policies and Small Scale Farmers in the East African Community

1 - Summary Report

Contribution to ESAFF regional advocacy strategy

Laurent Levard and Louis Pautrizel Gret

December 2014

(Updated version, taking into account Burundi report)

Summary:

The study *Agricultural and Food Security policies and small-scale farmers in the East African Community* was conducted by Gret as part of INVOLVE project conducted by ESAFF (*Eastern and Southern Africa Small Scale Farmers' Forum*) to review:

- the main policy commitments on agriculture and food security in East Africa, at national and regional levels, as well as the state of implementation and the main strengths, weaknesses and constraints for this implementation,
- the degree of involvement the civil society organisations, and specifically small scale farmers' organisations, in the policy process and their positions on these policies.

The present report is a *summary report* of six specific studies: one study on the regional EAC agricultural and food security policies, and five studies on the national agricultural and food security policies in Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda.

Bibliographic reference for citation:

LEVARD Laurent, PAUTRIZEL Louis, *Agricultural and Food Security Policies and Small-Scale Farmers in the East African Community – 1 - Summary Report – updated version* Paris, Gret - ESAFF, December 2014, p. 28

This report was produced with the financial support of the European Union
The viewpoints in this document do not in any way represent the official viewpoint of the European Union.



The East African Community (Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	4
ACRONYMS.....	5
INTRODUCTION.....	6
Objectives and scope of the study	6
Methodological approach	7
The summary report	7
I. BACKGROUND	9
1. Agriculture	9
2. Population, incomes, food and nutrition security.....	12
3. Main challenges	14
II. AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SECURITY POLICIES IN THE EAST AFRICAN COMMUNITY.....	16
1. National and regional levels.....	16
2. Overlapping and lack of coherence of policies at national level.....	16
3. Gaps between policy planning and implementation	17
4. Agriculture policies and small-scale farmers: Which strategy for agriculture development?	17
5. Private sector investments, but which private sector?.....	18
6. A lack of recognition of small-scale farmers' organizations	19
7. Some willingness to impose decisions to farmers.....	19
8. Food security and nutrition in agricultural policies	19
9. In general, a crop-centered and green-revolution approach.....	20
10. Gender issues	21
11. Trade policies: a key component of wider-agricultural and food security policies .	22
III. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	23
1. Asking the Governments to fulfil their commitments of allocating 10% of national budget to agriculture.....	23
2. Claiming for transparency and accountability on allocation and actual utilisation of budget at local and national levels	23
3. Building evidence-based arguments in favour of small-scale farming	24
4. Trade policies	26
5. Recognition and involvement of SSFs organisations.....	27
BIBLIOGRAPHY	28

ACRONYMS

CAADP	The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CET	Common External Tariff
EAC	East African Community
EPA	Economic Partnership Agreement
ESAFF	Eastern and Southern Africa Small Scale Farmers' Forum
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
MVIWATA	Mtandao wa Vikundi vya Wakulima Tanzania (National Network of Farmers' Groups in Tanzania)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NTB	Non-Tariff Barrier

INTRODUCTION

The present report was produced as part of INVOLVE project (Involving small scale farmers in policy dialogue and monitoring for improved food security in the East African Region) implemented by ESAFF (Eastern and Southern Africa Small Scale Farmers' Forum) in the five countries of the East African Community (EAC), namely Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda, in partnership with the Tanzanian small-scale farmers organisation MVIWATA and the French NGO Gret, with the participation of the other ESAFF members in Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda, and with the financial support of the European Union. INVOLVE project aims at strengthening the capacities of ESAFF and its members in the five countries of the East African Community (EAC):

- to contribute to the formulation and monitoring of the policies that have an impact on food security at local, national and regional levels;
- to foster agricultural commodities' trade within the region, building on MVIWATA-managed district-based bulk markets as pilot experience. MVIWATA has been supporting these bulk markets in various regions for more than ten years, in order to enhance market access for small scale farmers and improve trade conditions to their benefit.

Objectives and scope of the study

The objective of the study *Agricultural and Food Security policies and small-scale farmers in the East African Community* is to enable each ESAFF organisation to influence the situation in the countries of the EAC, as well at regional level. Specifically, the study is aimed at helping ESAFF organisations to build their national advocacy strategy and a regional strategy at EAC level.

The study does not intend to bring ready-made solutions or advocacy positions to be taken directly by ESAFF members. It intends to create a common understanding of food and agricultural policies of the five countries among ESAFF members.

An essential step of this study will be to put in debate the observations and the findings. Such debates will hopefully bring new questions on the table, new perspectives from other countries' experiences and fresh ideas to advance small scale farmers' interests.

This debate should help each ESAFF member organisation to make its own choices in terms of policy they want and advocacy they need to conduct.

The geographical coverage of the study is the same as the East African Community. This is due to the coverage of INVOLVE project and it makes sense in terms of regional agricultural policies. However, linkages among ESAFF members could be done at a large scale, involving other neighbouring countries.

The study focused on the following questions:

- What are the main policy commitments on food security in East Africa, at national and regional levels?
- What are the positions of civil society organisations on these policies?
- How is the civil society involved in the policy process and how does it monitor such commitments?

Methodological approach

As explained above, the purpose of the work is not to conduct an exhaustive research on agricultural and food security policies. It is more to mobilise knowledge of each country's situation to create exchange and debate among ESAFF members, in order to build the best possible advocacy strategies.

The methodological approach remained pragmatic and tried to use the best the limited resources available:

- Desk research on the context for food and nutrition security in the region and in the countries: situation, trends and key policies; and
- Interviews in country of key stakeholders: farmers' organisations, NGOs, civil society networks, ministries, academics, etc.

Study work was conducted by Laurent Levard and Louis Pautrizel, Gret experts in agricultural policies, with the participation of Cécile Laval for literature review activities, as part of a traineeship, in close relationship with ESAFF member organisations in the countries. Due to the constraints in time and resources, interviews and meetings had to be conducted in one week per country, leading to some gaps in the collection of data and interviews with stakeholders. However, as explained above, the study doesn't aim at being exhaustive in all policies and actors involved, but at creating debate and exchange among ESAFF members.

The findings were presented to and discussed with ESAFF members during a regional workshop, held in Dar es Salaam in September 2014.

The support provided by ESAFF members was extremely useful in identifying stakeholders, getting contacts, analysing primary raw information, etc. The result of the study is obviously influenced by what ESAFF members in the countries consider as key issues.

The authors thank all of the people they have interviewed for their cooperation in making this study possible.

The summary report

A specific study was conducted on regional EAC agricultural and food security policies as well as a study in each one of the following countries: Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, and Burundi.

The present report is a *summary report* of these specific studies. It is complemented by a *regional report* on regional policies and five *national reports* for each one of the countries: *Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, and Burundi*. This *summary report* is updated, in order to take into account the main findings of the recently implemented study on Burundi.

The present report summarizes the main findings of the regional and four national reports, in order to identify the similarities and differences between the various contexts. It consists of three parts:

- the first part refers to the economic and social background of the agricultural and food security policies (agriculture; population, incomes, and food and nutrition security; main challenges),
- the second part presents the main findings on agricultural and food security policies,
- the third part suggests some recommendations for small-scale farmers' organisations.

I. BACKGROUND

1. Agriculture

1.1 Agriculture, a key pillar of national economies and societies

In terms of employment, agriculture is the main economic sector of EAC countries, employing 89% of the labour force in Burundi and Rwanda, 73% in Tanzania and Uganda, and 71 % in Kenya¹. Over the last decade, this share has decreased by approximately 5% in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda, while it was virtually unchanged in Burundi and Rwanda.

In terms of Gross Domestic Product (GDP), which represents the total of new wealth (or value-added) produced in one year, the share of agriculture amounts to 40% in Burundi, 34% in Rwanda, 27% in Tanzania, 24% in Kenya and 21% in Uganda².

The differences between the shares of agriculture in terms of employment and of GDP reveal a lower productivity of agriculture than in other sectors, by measuring the productivity by means of current market prices. However, these differences can also be regarded as a massive transfer of value from agriculture to the rest of the society, due to the system of current market prices.

The population of agricultural households has been increasing by about one quarter over the last decade (+29% in Rwanda and Uganda, +28% in Burundi, +24% in Tanzania, and +22% in Kenya).

1.2 Agriculture is mainly based of small-scale farmers

In all the countries, the very large majority of farmers are small-scale farmers. The average size of a cultivated farm plot is 0.5 hectare in Burundi and Rwanda, 1.3 in Uganda, 2.5 in Kenya and 2.6 in Tanzania. Large scale farming is also present in Kenya and Tanzania, and, to a lesser extent, in Uganda. The size of cultivated farm plots tends to decrease in all countries, excepted in Tanzania where it has been slightly increasing over the last decade.

¹ FAO Stats, 2010 figures.

² FAO Stats, 2010 figures.

1.3 Agricultural products and technologies

The main agricultural food products in all the country of the region are cassava, maize, sweet potatoes, rice, bananas, sugar cane, beans, potatoes, vegetables, milk, chicken meat, and cattle meat (very few in Rwanda and Burundi).

The main crops for export are coffee and tea, as well as vegetables and flowers in Kenya and Uganda, cashew nuts in Tanzania, tobacco in Uganda, and in a lesser extent, sesame in Tanzania, and cotton in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda.

Hand cultivation is dominant. In Burundi and Rwanda, almost all rural households are only using hand hoes, as well as approximately 90% of Ugandan and 70% of Tanzanian ones. Ox-drawn plough is used by a significant number of farmers in Tanzania (25%/30%), while mechanized tractor plough is used by a minority of farmers (3% in Tanzania, less than 1% in Uganda).


Regarding the utilization of chemical fertilizers, there is a contrast between Kenya, where 81% of agricultural households are using them, and the other countries where only a minority uses those (16% in Tanzania). Kenya consumed the largest amount of fertilizer per hectare in the region. Despite a slight decline from 31.3 kg/ha in 2000 to 29 kg/ha in 2008, it was over four times greater than Rwanda's 6.8 kg/ha and almost six times more than Tanzania's 5.0kg/ha. Rwanda increased fertilizer use 22-fold, putting it second behind Kenya in 2008 after being placed last in 2000. Tanzania and Uganda increased their fertilizer use by more modest margins, while use in Burundi fell by almost 50% over the same period.

Generally, maintenance of soil fertility is based on traditional techniques (organic fertilizing), although many times farmers do not manage such fertility due to natural good soil fertility, or to a lack of resources or/and knowledge.

1.4 Agricultural production, areas and yields

Production volumes have been increasing in the last decade at a significant but irregular pace. Production growth is mainly due to an increase of cultivated land and not to an improvement of yields, which suggest serious limitations in terms of intensification of the production. In Burundi, as the possibilities for expansion of cultivated land are very limited and the yields are stagnating, agricultural production has been increasing very slowly. Rwanda is in the same situation in terms of land availability. However, it is the only country where yields have been increasing significantly over the last decade, allowing a growth of agricultural outputs.

Evolution of cereal yields (kg/ha) from 1990 to 2009 in the EAC countries



From Laibuni et al, 2012, source: FAO:Stat

Globally, from 2004-06 to 2010-12, food production *per capita* has been increasing strongly in Rwanda and much more slowly in Kenya and Tanzania. In Burundi and Uganda, food production *per capita* has been decreasing.

Evolution of domestic production *per capita* from 2004-06 to 2010-12

Country	2010-12 Food production index (2004-06 = 100)	2011 Population index (2005 = 100)	2010-12 Food production per capita (2004-06 = 100)
Burundi	108	117	92
Kenya	131	121	109
Rwanda	158	115	137
Tanzania	130	120	108
Uganda	112	128	88

Sources: Food production index : World Bank; Population: EAC Secretariat

1.5 Trade of agricultural and food products

All the countries produce the large part of the food consumed by the population. However, part of the consumption is based on imports from the rest of the World, in particular for rice, sugar and some manufactured goods. Intra-regional trade of agricultural and food products plays also a role for meeting the food needs and has been increasing over the last decade. There are many flows of cross-border trade within the region, which vary according to the season and the year. Part of the intra-regional trade is informal.

Kenya is the main importer of agricultural commodities, in particular rice and sugar from the rest of the World, rice and maize from Tanzania and maize from Uganda. Kenya exports manufactured food products to the other countries of the region. Tanzania exports maize and rice to the other countries of the region, although it also imports rice and sugar from the rest of the World, and maize from Uganda. In general terms, the food deficit of the region has been increasing over the last decade.

EAC countries are also exporting some specific commodities to the rest of the World (in particular, coffee, tea, and in the case of Kenya, flowers and vegetables).

2. Population, incomes, food and nutrition security

2.1 Population

In 2013, the population of EAC countries amounted to 143.5 million (46.2 million in Tanzania, 41.8 million in Kenya, 35.4 million in Uganda, 10.7 million in Rwanda and 9.4 million in Burundi). The very high density of population in Rwanda and Burundi should be noted (respectively 435 and 371 person per square kilometer), as well as, in a lesser extent in Uganda (176), while the density is much lower in Kenya (72) and Tanzania (52)³.

The annual population growth rate for the entire region is relatively high (2.9% in 2013), with no clear tendency to decline over the last decade (3.1% in 2003), the lowest rate being observed in Kenya (1.3%) and the highest in Uganda (3.6%). Over the last decade, the annual growth rate has been significantly decreasing in only two countries, namely Kenya (from 3.0% to 1.3%) and Rwanda (from 2.7% to 2.2%). Fertility rates remains very high (5.2 for all the region, from 4.6 in Kenya and Rwanda to 6.2 in Uganda), although they have been decreasing slowly over the last decade (-0.8 for all the region)⁴.

2.2 Incomes

The Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita amounts to 769 USD at regional level. GDP per capita is higher in Kenya (1.055) and lower in Burundi (294). The level is intermediary in Tanzania (742), Rwanda (709) and Uganda (633). From 2008 to 2013, GDP per capita has increased strongly in Rwanda and in Tanzania (respectively +4.4% and

³ EAC Secretariat, 2014

⁴ EAC Secretariat, 2014.

+4.1% per year), while the growth has been lower in the other countries (+1.8% in Kenya, and +1.4% in Burundi and Uganda)⁵.

2.3 Food and nutrition security

Food insecurity and malnutrition are real challenge for EAC countries. According to FAO, 52 million people were undernourished (deficit in calories) in 2010-12, which represented 37% of the population. The prevalence is very high in Burundi (73%) and lower in the other countries: 39% in Tanzania, 35% in Uganda, 30% in Kenya, and 29% in Rwanda. In eight years, the situation has been worsening, both in absolute and relative terms (43 million people were undernourished in 2004-06, representing 36% of the population). However, the evolution of the situation varies according to the countries with a clear improvement in Rwanda (from 42 to 29%), a slight improvement only in relative terms in Kenya (from 33% to 30%, which means deterioration in absolute terms), and a deterioration in the other countries, even in relative terms (from 68% to 73% in Burundi, from 35% to 39% in Tanzania, and from 28% to 35% in Uganda).

Evolution of Undernourishment in the EAC

Country	2004-2006			2010-2012			Evolution of prevalence from 2004-2006 to 2010-2012
	Total population (million)	Number of undernourished persons (million)	Prevalence of Undernourishment (%)	Total population (million)	Number of undernourished persons (million)	Prevalence of Undernourishment (%)	
Burundi	7,3	5,0	68	8,6	6,0	73	-
Kenya	35,6	12,0	33	41,6	13,0	30	+
Rwanda	9,2	4,0	42	10,9	3,0	29	++
Tanzania	38,8	14,0	35	46,2	18,0	39	-
Uganda	28,4	8,0	28	34,5	12,0	35	--
EAC	119,3	43,0	36	141,8	52,0	37	=

Source: FAOStat, 2014

Food insecurity, including hunger and malnutrition, can be evaluated in a more comprehensive way thanks to Global Hunger Index, which is calculated every year by IFPRI (International Food Policy Research Institute) and is based on three indicators: Proportion of people who are calorie deficient, Child malnutrition prevalence and Child mortality. Countries are ranked on a 100-point scale with 0 being the best score (no hunger) and 100

⁵ From EAC Secretariat, 2014.

being the worst. In 2013, the situation appears to be extremely alarming (more than 30 points in the scale) in Burundi (38.8), alarming (from 20 to 30) in Tanzania (20.6) and serious (from 10 to 20) in Uganda (19.2), Kenya (18.0) and Rwanda (15.3). Here too, the comparison with 2001 shows a clear improvement in Rwanda (from 25.5 to 15.3), while there is no significant improvement –or even a deterioration- in the other countries (from 38.5 to 38.8 in Burundi, from 19.9 to 18.0 in Kenya, from 23.6 to 20.6 in Tanzania, and from 17.7 to 19.2 in Uganda)⁶.

Evolution of Food insecurity (Global Hunger Index) in the EAC

	1990	2001	2011	2013	Situation in 2013
Burundi	33.8	38.5	37.5	38.8	Extremely Alarming
Kenya	21.4	19.9	18.2	18.0	Serious
Rwanda	33.8	25.5	21.0	15.3	Serious
Tanzania	23.4	23.6	20.1	20.6	Alarming
Uganda	21.4	17.7	16.7	19.2	Serious

Source: Welt Hunger Hilfe, IFPRI and Concern Worldwide, 2013.

3. Main challenges

Food insecurity and malnutrition, as well as poverty, remain major challenges for the countries of the East African Community which seriously undermine the conditions for a sustainable economic and social development. The situation has not significantly improved over the past decade, with the exception of Rwanda. The rural population –and specifically small-scale farming families- are the most affected by food insecurity and poverty. High malnutrition rates result of a series of factors including poor dietary intake.

Actually, the region is producing the main part of its food needs and has sufficient resources to import the part of the food products it doesn't produce itself. Agricultural output has been increasing over the past decade, but the growth of the level of food production *per capita* has been strong only in Rwanda, being much smaller in Kenya and Tanza-

⁶ Welt Hunger Hilfe, IFPRI and Concern Worldwide, 2013 *Global Hunger Index – The challenge of hunger : building resilience to achieve food and nutrition security*, October 2013

nia. At the same time, food production per capita has been decreasing in Burundi and Uganda.

Food insecurity sometimes results of problems of food availability in certain rural areas of Burundi, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda where the production is unstable over the time, part of the production is lost after harvesting and food shortages may occur. Due to many limitations to intra-regional trade, the surplus produced in some areas is not necessarily available in deficit areas.

Food insecurity is also related to problems of access to food when households need to buy food products (and specifically small-scale farming households in case of poor harvests) at high prices (in a context of price volatility) and monetary incomes are low.

While small-scale farming families represent the majority of the population -and an even larger majority of the poor and food-insecure population-, their agricultural outputs and incomes are very often not sufficient -and stable enough over time- to ensure their own food security, as well as to improve their livelihood and make them able to invest in their business and thus to increase their productivity and future incomes. In areas where the density of population is high and the scale of the plots is small, agriculture hardly provides full time employment for all the youth. Providing more employment, and thus incomes to more people in particular the youth, is another challenge.

Small-scale farmers face three types of main challenges:

- Low access to land, in particular in Burundi and Rwanda and in specific areas of the other countries, where the population density is very high. This gives also rise to the issue of the competition with other stakeholders for accessing to land resources, as well as, where some additional area is available, to the issue of who accesses to the equipment that allows to increase the area cultivated by each worker;
- Low yields per hectare (or per head of livestock) and their instability over the time. Over the past decade, agricultural production growth has generally resulted more from an increase of cultivated land than from an increase of yields. This reveals the constraints faced by the small-scale farmers to access to and implement technologies that allow increasing yields (and reducing post-harvest losses). It probably also reveals an increasing soil fertility crisis in many areas, that is exacerbated by climate change;
- Poor access of small-scale farmers to markets and low prices for their products. Small-scale farmers' bargaining power is often very weak, specifically for perishable goods and when farmers have no capacity to storage the products and have to sell them just after harvesting them. Consequently, part of the value-added produced by the farmers is captured by other stakeholders. It should be noted the existence of other ways to capture part of the value-added produced by the farmers, in particular the frequent high interest rates of the loans or the mechanisms of pre-harvest sales.

Access to appropriate inputs and investments (equipment, livestock) and to credit at affordable conditions, as well as other services, are thus main challenges, for increasing either the area per worker, yields per hectare (or per head of livestock) or producer prices, and eventually for increasing employment and small-scale farmers' outputs and incomes, and for improving food-security.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SECURITY POLICIES IN THE EAST AFRICAN COMMUNITY

1. National and regional levels

To a large extent Agriculture and Food Security Policies are **mainly** decided and implemented at **national level**. However, on one hand regional strategies and initiatives (EAC development strategy, EAC Food Security Action Plan, etc.) are aimed at providing a common framework in which national policies are developed and implemented. On the other hand, Governments have transferred a limited number of topics to the EAC level. Regional policy documents are thus focusing on these topics and do not intend to interfere more deeply into national policies.

Regional policies and programmes, like the CAADP, cover the following topics related to agriculture and food security that imply effective cooperation and common decisions among the countries: infrastructure, trade with the rest of the world and inside the region: Common External Tariff (CET), common market, trade facilitation (mutual recognition and unification of norms and standards, simplification of customs procedures, elimination of other non-tariff barriers), pastoralists law, framework on biosafety, prevention and control of transboundary animal and zoonotic diseases; regional preparedness and response plan for pastoralists in arid and semi-arid areas, food security strategic reserves. The level of progress and implementation of these different policies varies hugely. Trade protection through the Common External Tariff (CET) and measures for facilitating trade integration are the most advanced regional policies.

At national level, local Governments are getting increased responsibilities in agricultural policies, specifically in Kenya and Tanzania.

2. Overlapping and lack of coherence of policies at national level

At national level, there are very often a multitude of **overlapping policies and initiatives** (plans, programmes, strategies), which **coherence** is frequently hard to understand. It is particularly the case in Tanzania, where the multiple initiatives partially reveals the existence of different strategies for agricultural development. Referring to Tanzania, Damian Gabagambi stresses that “clarifications on the linkages between these initiatives are usually given by politicians and technocrats. Nonetheless authentic and convincing linkage is hard to come by. It suffices to say that the initiatives are usually running parallel”⁷. The existence of this myriad of initiatives decreases the agricultural policy coherence. A real effort to strengthen the coor-

⁷ Gabagambi Damian, *Assessing Implementation of CAADP in Tanzania and Engagement of Smallholder Farmers*, Mviwata, 2013

dination or policy-initiatives has been done in Rwanda and is under way in Kenya and Burundi.

It should be noted that **CAADP process** constitutes a positive effort to create a greater consistency between the various initiatives and to align donors and private sector funding with the national priorities, as well as to build a common regional framework. However, many initiatives remain outside CAADP process and the lack of coherence between the various initiatives remains a real challenge.

3. Gaps between policy planning and implementation

There is a frequent lack of information on the level of implementation of the policies (Tanzania, Kenya, and Uganda). Beyond initial policy plans and budgets, it is often difficult to have a clear picture of which actions have been actually implemented and which financial amounts have been effectively spent in the different activities.

Actually, there is frequently a gap between **policy planning** and **actual implementation**; and between policies planning and **financial resources**, especially since part of the resources are generally expected from donors and private sector, as for example for CAADP investment plans. These financial gaps are generally acknowledged in the policy documents.

4. Agriculture policies and small-scale farmers: Which strategy for agriculture development?

Agricultural and food security policies documents often mention that members of farming families are the main part of the food-insecure population.

However, while being policies, strategies and plans often very detailed on some specific issues, they very many times don't specify which kind of agriculture should be promoted. Setting 6% growth target for agricultural sector, as EAC Governments have made, doesn't indicate through which kind of agricultural model. In Tanzania and Uganda, the government doesn't seem always clear on who should contribute to the 6% growth, although there is a bias for large-scale farming. In Kenya, the government clearly expects this growth to come from large scale commercial farmers. In Rwanda and Burundi, agricultural policies are more clearly focused on small scale farmers.

Will the various components of the policies benefit to small scale farmers in priority? Or will they benefit mainly to large-scale farmers and large companies? Actually it is most likely that there is no true reflection and no evidence-based decisions on which type of agriculture is the most appropriate for generating most value-added, wealth, social development, sustainability and resilience.

Many objectives and actions are potentially positive for small-scale farmers, but at the condition that they are focused on this sector and that their implementation takes really into account the specificities and needs of small-scale farming.

Some elements of the policies suggest more or less that large-scale farmers or big companies should be direct beneficiaries of such policies, with some indirect positive impacts on small-scale farmers. For example, contract farming and out-grower schemes are supposed to facilitate small-scale farmers' access to capital, inputs, technologies and markets. However, there are no clear arguments –or the arguments are very controversial- on how this strategy would effectively benefit small scale farmers. There is no mention that this kind of strategy may have direct or indirect negative consequences for small-scale farmers, specifically land-grabbing at the expense of local communities and high dependence of individual small-scale farmers with regard to the large companies, with which they are linked, with a balance of forces favourable to the latter.

Additionally, some instruments promoted by the agricultural policies, such as insurance instruments, are hardly accessible to small-scale farmers.

The situation is different when large-scale farming is practically non-existent, as is Rwanda where the agricultural policy explicitly focuses on small-scale farmers. The same situation occurs in Burundi. However there is a real pressure by some urban and rich people or by companies for accessing to lands.

5. Private sector investments, but which private sector?

In the same way, policies generally highlight the the role of private sector investments, but **without clear definition** of what is private sector. Private sector concept should normally include small scale farmers since they all handle a private business. They are most likely to be the first private investors in agriculture, and policies can enhance small scale farmers' investments by providing a more secure and enabling environment (land tenure, financial services, infrastructures, etc.). However, policies implicitly consider as private sector only large investors and agribusiness companies as private sector. There is a **lack of recognition of small-scale farmers as main private sector investors**

As an illustration, there are 30 occurrences of *private sector* in the 50 pages *EAC Food Security Action Plan*, mostly in the detailed action plan in which it is considered as a key actor. On the other hand, the term *smallholder farmers* is quoted 16 times, mostly to describe the farming situation and only once in the action part (“Promote fish farming especially among smallholder farmers and the youth”). As a comparison, in the same document, *civil society* is quoted twice, the same as *cooperatives*, while *farmers' organizations* is quoted three times.

Additionally, some policies tend to prioritize large companies and foreign investors in value-chains and fail to mention the potential of investment of local small and medium investors.

6. A lack of recognition of small-scale farmers' organizations

Small-scale farmers' organizations are **hardly recognized as stakeholders/partners** in policy processes (elaboration and implementation).

In speeches, it is often claimed to put farmers first. However, they actually very often remain beneficiaries of policies decided and implemented by other stakeholders, being very limited the involvement of small scale farmers' organisations. Exceptions should be noted in some product-centred policies in Kenya, or recently in Burundi.

The recent (June 2014) declaration of the African Union in Malabo through which the Ministers of agriculture recognised the role and responsibilities of farmers, pastoralists and fishers –among other stakeholders- in driving the agricultural transformation agenda may constitute a step forward, provided that it is followed by action.

7. Some willingness to impose decisions to farmers

In some occasions, Governments tend to impose technical and economic decisions to farmers. That reveals a **lack of recognition of farmers as relevant decision-makers**. It is mainly the case in Rwanda with the policy of land-consolidation through which the Government intend to impose a regional specialization of agriculture with priority crops, while the diversity of crops in farming systems generally constitutes a key element for:

- a proper management of cash flows, annual agricultural working schedule, risks related to agronomic and market conditions, and soil fertility;
- the resilience of the farming system,
- family diet diversity, and
- the economic efficiency of the farming system thanks to a higher annual output and value-added per hectare.

8. Food security and nutrition in agricultural policies

Food Security is generally considered as a **general objective** of the agricultural policies. Increasing agricultural outputs and incomes is considered as a key issue for reducing poverty and improving food security. However, there is a **poor reflexion** on the link between increased production and food security. The impact of each type of agriculture on employment and incomes of food insecure households is not taken into account. What are the consequences of prioritizing small-scale farming or large-scale farming and agro-business in terms of employment, incomes, and income distribution and consequently in terms of

food security? Does each particular way of intensification entail employment generation or employment destruction? These issues are not really addressed.

Regarding the nutrition dimension of food security, it is gaining momentum in national agendas, with an increasing awareness of the potential role of agriculture in reducing malnutrition. However policies don't clearly address the **link between agriculture and nutrition**. Policy makers don't seem really clear on how agriculture can contribute to reduce under-nutrition and improve the nutrition status of the population. Policies sometimes tend to prioritize the production of the main foodstuffs (maize and rice) and not to give special attention to food production diversification, by example through integration of animal production in the farming systems. Girinka programme in Rwanda constitutes a counterexample. Under this program, dairy cows have been distributed to poor households which is a real success. Milk production and consumption has significantly improved in the country. Projects are also implementing this kind of actions in Burundi.

In addition, an effective coordination between agricultural sector interventions and other sectors interventions that impact in nutrition (health, sanitation, education) is generally missing.

9. In general, a crop-centered and green-revolution approach

Agricultural policies tend to be *crop-centered*, i.e. to focus on the production of some specific crops (in particular maize and rice) that are, by the way, key for population food security. They give less attention to diversification of agricultural and food products, while such diversification is a way not only for improving population's nutrition status, but also for minimizing climate risks, properly distributing labour requirements and incomes all over the year, and increasing annual production per hectare.

At the same time, agricultural policies generally focus on the promotion of green-revolution technologies that entail intensive use of external inputs such as hybrid and genetically modified seeds, and the associated agro-chemicals (fertilisers and pesticides). The limitations and negative effects of green revolution are ignored.

Successes and limitations of the Green Revolution

As a general rule, in many countries, implementation of Green-Revolution techniques has often been a success and has enabled a strong increase in per-hectare yields in places where agro-climatic conditions are brought under control well and are stable over time, and where the environment enjoys enough initial fertility (especially the organic fertility of the soil, which conditions its capacity to retain mineral elements and water and to resist erosion). However Green-Revolution techniques have often been a failure when agro-climatic conditions are not sufficiently under control, when the environment is fragile, and when satisfactory solutions have not been beforehand provided to the sustainable man-

agement of soil fertility. Then, these techniques have turned out to be specially risky and dangerous for farmers. This is because such techniques tend to simplify and specialise the farming systems, thereby destroying the aspects of biodiversity, practices, systems for protection of soil, and sustainable management of fertility that could have lasted. At the same time, these techniques lead to an increase in production costs.

In such kinds of situations, traditional systems ecological crisis and Green-Revolution perverse effects join together to weaken family-farming economies. Implementing such techniques has often led family farmers to even deeper crisis or even bankruptcy. This is why they frequently tend to reject such techniques⁸.

It should be noted that the growth of the agricultural production in the region is mainly due to an increase of cultivated land and not to an improvement of yields. We can assume that the increasing use of chemical fertilizers in the region, that allows a limited growth of yields, has been hiding the soil fertility crisis. Resolving such crises entails improving soil organic fertility and thus higher integration of breeding activities in the farming systems or/and, agroecological techniques.

Generally speaking, agricultural policies overlook agroecological techniques which, in many regions, allow responding to the ecological crisis that contributes to the economic and social crisis of small-scale farmers' families. For example, the various forms of integration between agricultural crops and breeding activities are not focused although they are frequently a promising pathway for intensifying agricultural production and increasing yields and productivity. However, positive trends should be noted in Rwanda and Burundi.

Similarly, we have not been able to find evidence of any thinking on forms of agricultural mechanization that are relevant for small-scale farmers that is to say that allow addressing the effective bottlenecks of the farming systems, without necessarily entailing a massive substitution of capital for labour.

10. Gender issues

Women that work in agriculture face discriminations, for example for the access to land resources in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi. They are hardly recognized as autonomous economic stakeholders, while they constitute the major part of the labour force employed in agriculture and generally, in comparison, with men, use a major part of their income in improving family livelihood.

Gender issues are sometimes mentioned in agricultural policies but **few concrete actions** are implemented to address specific needs of women and gender inequality.

⁸ Levard Laurent, and Apollin, Frédéric, 2013.

11. Trade policies: a key component of wider-agricultural and food security policies

Strictly speaking, trade policies are not agricultural and food security policies. However, they strongly impact both agriculture and food security.

EAC Common External Tariff (CET) provides an efficient protection against the competition by low-price products imported from the world market.

However, the current protection sometimes doesn't always benefit farmers: while consumers pay higher prices than international ones, the difference between the prices paid by consumers and the price paid to the farmers may be very high. Such low effectiveness of value chains is due to:

- high costs (transport, agro-processing, storage) and high level of post-harvest losses,
- the existence of a great number of stakeholders, as well as the low bargaining power of small scale farmers. As a result, great part of the value-added is captured by various stakeholders at the expense of small scale farmers.

Non-Tariff Barriers (NTBs) contribute to aggravate both phenomena⁹.

Moreover, frequent waivers, mainly on rice, tend to jeopardize the mechanism of protection and to affect farmers. A quota of rice imports from Kenya is tariff-exempted and other exemptions are regularly put in place for rice by several countries in order to address food price rises at national level. These decisions have been criticized regionally because of their negative impacts on prices paid to the farmers.

At the same time, national export bans have regularly been put in place, in particular by Tanzania for maize, in order to address food price rises at national level. However it seems that no export bans have been put in place since 2012. Tanzanian export bans are very often criticized for their negative impacts both on consumers of the other countries (who must pay higher prices) and for Tanzanian farmers who cannot take advantage of intra-regional trade opportunities and good prices.

⁹ Levard, L., Gambagambi, D., 2012, and Levard L., Amel Benkahla, 2013

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings of the national reports and the regional report, we suggest some recommendations for small-scale farmers' organizations both at national and regional level.

1. Asking the Governments to fulfil their commitments of allocating 10% of national budget to agriculture

According to Damian Gabagambi¹⁰, most of EAC countries have not fulfilled the commitment they have made under CAADP process to allocate 10% of national budgets to agriculture. Only Burundi has fulfilled this commitment with a 14.3% allocation to agriculture in 2014/15 (however this figure includes donations in complement of the own resources). For the other countries, the share of the budget allocated to agriculture is 8% in Rwanda, 5.7% in Tanzania, 3.3% in Kenya, and 3.2% in Uganda.

Consequently, asking the Governments to fulfil their commitment for a 10% budget allocation to agriculture should remain a priority of small-scale farmers' organisations, taking into account the weight of agriculture in national economies and employment, as well as the potential of agriculture growth for contributing to poverty reduction (agricultural development is believed to be two to four times more effective in reducing hunger and poverty than any other sector), improvement of food and nutrition security and development of the whole economy. Moreover, it is important to ask governments to allocate to agriculture 10% of their own resources, so as they are not dependent of the donors both in terms of amounts and priorities.

2. Claiming for transparency and accountability on allocation and actual utilisation of budget at local and national levels

We have already mentioned the frequent gap between policies that exist on paper and their actual implementation. That's why the strategy of ESAFF members to ask for transparency and accountability on allocation and actual utilisation of budget at local and national levels is fully relevant. Effective monitoring on agricultural and food security policies, as well as relevant process for regularly sharing and discussing the results of such monitoring with all stakeholders is essential.

¹⁰ Gabagambi, Damian, 2014.

3. Building evidence-based arguments in favour of small-scale farming

Beyond the amounts allocated to agriculture, a key issue is for which kind of agriculture and which kind of expenditures is this budget spent, in other terms: **for whom and for which actions and investments is the agricultural budget spent?** And how are the funds brought by donors and the financial resources of some large investors oriented by the governments?

In order to advocate for an allocation of agricultural resources that meet the needs of the small-scale farmers, small-scale farmers' organisations should be able:

- On one hand to build and widely disseminate evidence-based arguments in favour of small-scale farming,
- On the other hand, to better identify the key investments, services and regulations required by small-scale farmers.

3.1 Building and disseminating evidence-based arguments in favour of small-scale farming

In order to make possible the full recognition of small-scale farmers as key stakeholders for the country (and for the region as a whole), their organisations should be able to build **evidence-based arguments in favour of small-scale farming.**

Although the weight of pro-large-scale farming and pro-agribusiness vision is largely due to the influence of private interests and powerful lobbies, it is also based on the idea that:

- addressing successfully food insecurity is just a question of increasing agricultural outputs,
- large-scale farming is more able to increase production than small-scale farming. Similarly, large-scale farming is supposed to be more able to contribute to GDP growth through increased outputs for national, regional and global markets.

In response to these arguments, small-scale farmers' organisations should continue to develop evidence-based arguments that demonstrate why small-scale farming should be prioritized.

On one hand, it should be reminded that:

- food security of the regional population, i.e. 140 million people, is currently essentially based on the work and the investments of the small-scale farmers themselves. Moreover, small-scale farming has actually a real potential for increasing investments and production;
- most of food insecure population in the EAC region are small-scale farmers' family members, which means that fighting food insecurity primarily requires improving small-scale farming outputs and incomes and thus strengthening their own economic activities. When farmers grow more food and earn more income, they can achieve self-sufficiency and live better lives.

On the other hand, specific assessments should be carried out on small-scale and large-scale family farming, as well on various kinds of technological, economic and social pathways for agricultural development. In many countries, surveys have clearly revealed that, when small-scale farmers benefit from a favourable economic environment (access to productive re-

sources, credit, appropriated technologies and market) –which is unfortunately usually not the case-, the value-added per hectare produced by their farming systems is much higher than those produced by large-scale estates. This is due to the fact that small-scale farmers implement labour-intensive farming systems¹¹. Assessing the comparative economic performances of small-scale and large-scale farming in the EAC region, is essential, specifically when both benefit from a favourable economic environment. Success stories should be investigated deeply, for example in Rwanda where agriculture production has been increasing and poverty decreasing fastly over the last years. Which farming systems produce not only higher yields per hectare but also higher value-added per hectare and higher social productivity of labour (i.e. calculation of labour productivity that takes into account all the population regardless of whether people are employed or not)?

Similarly, assessing the effective impact of large-scale farming and agri-business investments on local communities is essential. Which are the impacts of land grabbing on communities' livelihood? Do private large-scale investments actually create well-paid jobs opportunities, or better access to markets for small-scale farming? Finally what are the impacts in terms of social development, food security, as well as environment?

In addition, the indirect and induced effects on the whole economy of the various pathways for agricultural development should be taken into account. It is well known that, in comparison with other social classes (and specifically the richest ones), small-scale farmers are more likely to spend their incomes on basic consumer goods or on means of agricultural production that can be produced locally or regionally. Consequently, small-scale farming is more likely than other types of agriculture to generate indirect and induced effects on other economic sectors.

Beyond the development of evidence-based arguments for small-scale farming focused strategies, their wide dissemination should be a priority of small-scale farmers organisations, as part of advocacy, campaigning and communication strategies.

3.2 Identifying key challenges and limitations, and requirements of investments, services and regulations for small-scale farmers

Small-scale farmers, through their own organisations, should be able to identify clearly which are their **key challenges and limitations**, in particular for women and youth, taking into account national and local specific situations. Such task is a condition for identifying the **key investments, services, and regulations** that are necessary for meeting the needs of small-scale farmers. Investments can be investments by the farmers in the farms themselves, collective investments by the farmers in the value chains, other private investments or public investments that contribute to meet small-scale farmers' needs.

¹¹ They only use technologies that substitute labour by capital when, by doing this, they can increase the global labour productivity without generating unemployment within the family. By using relatively few labour-saving technologies, the costs of production per hectare (inputs, amortization of equipment) tend to be lower which contributes to a higher value-added per hectare.

It should be highlighted that small scale farmers have specific needs that can differ or the needs of large-scale farming in terms of financial services, marketing and value chains linkages, storage, and processing facilities, water management, appropriated technologies, research, and advisory services.

Farmers should be able to advocate for technologies and investments more appropriated to small-scale farmers, local communities and the society at large and for targeting public and donors funds towards these investments.

4. Trade policies

As trade policies have significant consequences on agricultural markets and prices, small-scale farmers' organisations should include trade issues in their advocacy agendas, namely:

- **EAC Common External Tariff (CET).** The CET is highly protective for many key agricultural products. This protection is an asset for agriculture, as it provides a favourable context for small-scale farmers which productivity is generally lower than that of many farmers of exporting countries, and who need to benefit good prices in order to make a decent livelihood from agriculture and invest in their business. High levels of protection make it possible to increase intra-regional trade flows and reduce regional food dependency. However, as mentioned above, such protection is not enough for ensuring farmers are receiving good prices. That means that advocacy and initiatives for improving value-chains functioning are equally important than advocating for maintaining protective tariffs.
- **Negotiations on Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA).** Small-scale farmers' organisations should be attentive to the possible impacts of the Economic Partnership Agreement (APE) that the East African Community is currently negotiating with the European Union and that could in particular undermine the potential for developing agro-processing activities¹².
- **Regional trade integration.** Elimination of non-tariff-barriers and export bans is necessary to ease intra-regional trade and promote the development of the production. Regional policies related to infrastructures, trade and norms and standards should be deepened and improved in order to increase value chains effectiveness and thus allowing small scale farmers to better take advantage of regional market protection
- **Markets regulation.** Criticisms of some tariffs-waivers and of export bans are justified. However, these policies show that a regional food security policy is necessary so as to avoid excessive price volatility, since it would be a mistake to assume that agricultural markets regulate themselves automatically. The transfer of agricultural market

¹² Levard Laurent, and Bigot Amélie, 2014

regulation to the regional level is planned to some extent (mainly food reserves) in the EAC policy documents but very little progress is made in this regard. There might be some fear from national governments to transfer sovereignty on this highly sensitive issue, without clearly defining a strategy. With the support of international cooperation, the region should implement food security policies that include, in addition to a substantial improvement in local small-scale farmers storage capacities, local, national and regional emergency stocks; market monitoring and information systems (that should involve the stakeholders currently taking initiatives in this area) and appropriate measures to enable the effective supply deficit areas with stock areas surplus¹³. Regional buffer stocks, which can be used for market regulation while reducing dependency on volatile global markets, should not be excluded notwithstanding the opposition of the many organisations that promote a full liberalisation of agricultural markets.

5. Recognition and involvement of SSFs organisations

Farming policies are currently implemented by governments, with the participation of or partners such as NGOs and private sector stakeholders. However, small-scale farmers' organisations are hardly associated.

Improving the capacity of small scale farmers' organisations for influencing agricultural and food security policies is a key issue. They should be fully recognized in the designing, implementation and monitoring of the policies, both at national and regional levels. Involving small scale farmers in policy processes is also an avenue to increase the efficiency of these policies.

At regional level, it would be useful for ESAFF to get the EAC status observer. This status offers some advantages to be able to follow and influence policy processes and decisions:

- Getting information on what is discussed at EAC level, and therefore having the possibility to elaborate own positions when needed;
- Being invited to meeting with stakeholders;
- Being officially recognized as partner by the regional authorities.

At national level, the capacity of small-scale farmers' organisations to influence policies in the future is a key issue. It will depend on their capacity to increase their representativeness and recognition (and providing services to their members may contribute to strengthen the organisations and to increase the recognition of small-scale farmers and their organisations), define relevant advocacy objectives, develop and implement advocacy and communication strategies, build alliances with other stakeholders, and mobilise farmers in key occasions.

¹³ Levard Laurent and Gabagambi Damian, 2012

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- EAC Secretariat, East-African Community Facts and Figures – 2014, September 2014
- Gabagambi, Damian, *Assessing Implementation of CAADP in Tanzania and Engagement of Smallholder Farmers*, Mviwata, 2013
- Gabagambi, Damian, *Trends towards Agriculture Budget Allocation*, oral presentation, Regional Training Workshop on Agriculture Policy Advocacy, Communication and Public Expenditure Tracking, ESAFF, Dar es Salaam, 29 September 2014 – 3 October 2014
- Levard, Laurent and Pautrizel, Louis, *Agricultural and Food Security Policies and Small-Scale Farmers in the East African Community – Report 2 – Regional Policies*, Paris, Gret, 2014
- Levard, Laurent, *Agricultural and Food Security Policies and Small-Scale Farmers in the East African Community – Report 5 – Tanzania*, Paris, Gret, 2014
- Levard, Laurent, *Politiques agricoles et de sécurité alimentaire et paysannerie dans la Communauté de l’Afrique de l’Est – Rapport 7 – Burundi*, Paris, Gret, 2014
- Levard Laurent, and Apollin, Frédéric, *Agroecology: A Response to the Agricultural and Food Challenges of the 21st Century*, Coordination SUD, 2013
- Levard, Laurent, and Benkahla, Amel., *How to promote Intra-African Agricultural Trade? – Summary report*, Gret, Etudes et Travaux n°36, 2013
- Levard, Laurent, and Bigot, Amélie, *Economic Partnership Agreements and Agriculture: Which challenges for Africa?*, Coordination Sud, 2014
- Levard, Laurent, and Gabagambi, Damian, *Intra-Regional Trade Limitations for Agricultural Commodities in the EAC*, GRET, December 2012
- Pautrizel, Louis, *Agricultural and Food Security Policies and Small-Scale Farmers in the East African Community – Report 3 – Kenya*, Paris, Gret, 2014
- Pautrizel, Louis, *Agricultural and Food Security Policies and Small-Scale Farmers in the East African Community – Report 4 – Rwanda*, Paris, Gret, 2014
- Pautrizel, Louis, *Agricultural and Food Security Policies and Small-Scale Farmers in the East African Community – Report 6 – Uganda*, Paris, Gret, 2014
- Welt Hunger Hilfe, IFPRI and Concern Worldwide, *2013 Global Hunger Index – The challenge of hunger : building resilience to achieve food and nutrition security*, October 2013