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Major development strategies in retrospect, 1960-2000


“Big push” capital-intensive investment
Integrated rural development; state-led development
Structural adjustment; liberalization; conditionality
“Big-push” revisited; African-led policy initiatives (e.g., NEPAD, Budget support)
Community-driven development
Current thinking on “strategy”

- Emerging coalition for “big push” agricultural strategy
  - e.g., Sachs, Sanchez,…maybe Gates?

- Strong consensus about need for greater investment in public goods (infrastructure, crop science) and certain policy reforms

- Major debate with regard to what constitutes the right “enabling environment”
  - Food price support/stabilization
  - Input subsidies

- Many of these debates can be informed by a solid empirical understanding of how rural economies work
Organization of presentation:

1. Underappreciated “empirical regularities” of small farm agriculture in Africa
2. Discuss the implications of these findings for current policy debates

Six underappreciated aspects about African agriculture:

1. Farm sizes are declining → Huge land disparities → rural population is hardly growing → new demands on food marketing systems
2. Given plausible assumptions about productivity growth possibilities, grain productivity growth will be inadequate to kick-start growth in most of the region → diversification into higher-return activities will be crucial
3. Most farmers in the region are buyers of staple food → directly hurt by higher grain prices
4. Retail food prices are trending downward in most of the region
Six underappreciated aspects about African agriculture:

5. Supermarkets account for less than 4% of urban food expenditures in almost all African countries. Even with major growth in supermarket volume, investments in traditional marketing channels will remain much more important for small farmer and consumer welfare.

6. “Market liberalization” -- inaccurate description of situation in E&S Africa

Fact #1

- Emerging land pressures are generating fundamental challenges for poverty reduction and investment strategies
## Cultivated land per agricultural person (hectares)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## Farm size distribution:
Small farm sector

![Farm size distribution chart](chart.png)
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Characteristics of smallholder farmers, Zambia 1999/00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>Farm size (ha)</th>
<th>Asset values (US$)</th>
<th>Gr. Rev., maize sales (US$)</th>
<th>Gr. Rev., crop sales (US$)</th>
<th>Total hh income (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 50% of maize sales</td>
<td>23,680 (2%)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>2,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of maize sellers</td>
<td>234,988 (23%)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households not selling maize</td>
<td>762,566 (75%)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rural population growth rates

![Bar chart showing annual growth rates in various countries between 1998 and 2000.](image)
More than 50% of Africa’s population will be urban by 2015.

- 2000: 10 farm households feed 7 non-farm households
- 2020: 10 farm households feed 16 non-farm households

Upshot: urban demand for food is rising rapidly
Are imported wheat and rice crowding out domestically-produced grain?

- 3.6% annual growth in cereal imports
- Of total grain imports by African countries, only 5% is produced by African farmers
- Growth in urban demand is being met mainly by imported rice and wheat

Importance of Imported Staples in Nairobi Expenditure Patterns

![Figure 7: Expenditure on Primary Staples (KSh per a.e/month)](image)
Fact #2

- Given plausible assumptions about new technology development, farm sizes are too small for grain-based productivity growth to lift most rural households out of poverty
- Hence, diversification into higher-return activities will be crucial
- This transition is already occurring

Role of maize in farm sales revenue is declining (share of gross sales revenue)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maize</th>
<th>Other grains/beans/oilseeds</th>
<th>Non-food cash crops</th>
<th>Fruits - veges</th>
<th>Animal products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozam</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fact #3

- Most rural farm households are buyers of maize (or net buyers)

Smallholder Households’ Position in the Maize Market
Fact #3

- Most rural farm households are buyers of maize (or net buyers)
- 2% of households account for 50% of marketed grain surplus
- Crop price supports:
  - highly concentrated benefits
  - anti-poor
  - Most likely impede small farm diversification into higher-valued activities

Fact #4

- Retail maize meal prices are trending downward
Nairobi: Price trends

Linear trend (meal): -0.572***
Linear trend (grain): -0.1060

Wholesale maize grain
Retail maize meal
Linear-trend-grain
Linear-trend-meal

1% level of significance

Lusaka: Price trends

Wholesale grain
Breakfast meal
Linear-trend-grain
Linear-trend-meal
Fact #4

- Retail maize meal prices are trending downward
- Why?
  - Food market reform has encouraged rapid investment in informal, small-scale milling and trading networks
  - The informal channel exerts competitive pressure on commercial millers/retailers
  - Exception: South Africa
Fact #5

- The performance of “traditional” food systems will remain a much more important determinant of farmer welfare and consumer food security than global “supermarkets”
- Hence, focus investment priorities on improving the performance of traditional food marketing systems
  - linking traditional with new agribusiness systems
Even with 20% annual growth in supermarket share, in relatively progressive Kenya, in 10 years, the supermarket share will be:

12.4% market share in 2016.
Fact #6

- Major misunderstanding of the staple food and input market policy environment
  - “liberalization” – a misnomer
  - Marketing boards continue to play major role in food and input markets
    - Handle 25-60% of marketed maize in Zambia, Kenya, Malawi, Zimbabwe
  - Policy uncertainty

Food Reserve Agency Maize Purchases and Estimated Sales from Smallholder Sector, Zambia

Source: Jayne, Mather, Mghenyi, 2006
Sources of Policy Unpredictability

- Export bans, import quotas
- Uncertainty over changes in import tariff rates
- When and where will marketing boards enter the market, at what price
- Conclusion: Price uncertainty is very high in the “liberalization” era, partially due to the operations of governments
• Why does it matter how we characterize the market environment over past 15 years?
• It matters a great deal

African Countries - % Growth in Cereal Production between 1985 and 2005
African Countries - % Growth in Cereal Production between 1985 and 2005

Where from here?

- Implications of:
  - > 50% of rural farm households have < 1 hectare and are extremely poor
  - > 50% of rural farm households are net buyers of staple food
  - Massive rural-to-urban migration: massive under-employment
  - but lacking the human capital to contribute productively to society
Much research evidence documents high returns to investment in

1. R & D: (Alston, Grilliches, Mellor)
2. Education: turns information into knowledge (Johnston)
3. Extension systems: farm management (Evenson)
4. Infrastructure: road, rail, port, communications (Antle)
5. Investments in health and addressing HIV/AIDS (Binswanger)

IFPRI review of rate of return studies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies</td>
<td>Negative – 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- research &amp; extension</td>
<td>35% to 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- roads</td>
<td>20% to 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- education</td>
<td>15% to 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- communications</td>
<td>10% to 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- irrigation</td>
<td>10% to 15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we believe these findings, they have major implications
Budget allocation to Agricultural Sector in Zambia: ZMK465 million in 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Emoluments</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational funds</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation Development</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security Pack &amp; EDRP</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Reserve Agency Maize Marketing</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer Support Program</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fertilizer source:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landholding size</td>
<td>ha per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>‘000 kwacha per capita</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Households not acquiring fertilizer: | 266 | 173 | .15 |

Source: Govereh et al, 2006
### Zambia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fertilizer source:</th>
<th>Total Income</th>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Landholding size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households not acquiring fertilizer:</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash purchases from private retailers:</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Fertilizer Support Program (50% subsidy)</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Govereh et al, 2006
As massive as the poverty problems are now, they will be much greater unless budgets are re-allocated sooner or later to investments that will make the economy productive in the long-term:

- Population growth w/o productivity growth → civil strife
- Not a viable option to have more and more “fragile” or “failed” states

Major Challenge:

- how to provide incentives for states to reallocate public budgets toward crucial investments with long-term payoffs instead of programs with short-term payoffs with limited impact on L.T. development?
- Future of ‘untied’ budget support?
Donor budget support

Government budget

• Long-term productive investments: R&D, extension, irrigation, etc.

• Low immediate payoffs
  • High medium/long-term payoffs

• Fertilizer subsidies,
  • marketing board price supports,
  • land bills, food aid

• Immediate political payoffs;
  • Visible support to constituencies
  • contribution to sustained poverty reduction is unclear

Policy response (cont.)

• Lobby forcefully for more level playing field in international trade
  – OECD support for Africa: $50 bill./yr
  – OECD ag. subsidies: $350 bill./yr
Policy Implications – going out on a limb

1. Incentives for government to reallocate expenditure patterns toward those that reduce costs in the system
2. Greater, but more selective, donor support for growth-promoting investments – move away from budget support
3. Policy stability and predictability
4. Food self-reliance, not food self-sufficiency
5. Implicit in all the above are thorny political economy issues that must be addressed
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