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Objectives:

1. to assess how changes in world prices have affected food and fertilizer prices in the region;
2. to determine likely effects on cropping patterns, food production, and the potential for food crises;
3. to consider implications for national policies and regional initiatives (e.g., CAADP, ACTESA)

Why have world food prices risen so dramatically in 2007-2008?

• Initial explanations – structural shifts in world food supply and demand:
  – US bio-fuels policy
  – Rising incomes in large middle-income countries (e.g., China, India)
  – Climate change (e.g. recurrent drought in Australia)
• More recent explanations acknowledge these structural shifts but also include:
Impacts of higher world prices on maize prices and the food situation in eastern and southern Africa
Five Main Findings:

1. World food prices are tumbling but continue to rise in many parts of E/S Africa
2. Evidence that Zambia and Malawi will face a food crisis by early 2009, not because world food prices are abnormally high, but because of slow recognition of the need to import
3. Unreliable crop estimates → raising potential for food crises
4. The specter of food crisis is heightened by barriers to regional trade
5. Even though world food prices are rapidly falling, the food situation in E/S Africa will remain precarious at least into 2009

Finding 1:

Despite the tumbling of international maize prices, maize prices in many parts of E/S Africa continue to rise
Finding 2:

Evidence of food crises emerging in Zambia and possibly Malawi in early 2009

- not because world food prices are abnormally high, but because of physical shortages
  - ADMARC rationing its sales to consumers
- Domestic prices > $500/mt. Cost of importation from South Africa < $380
- However, import licenses were arranged only in December for Zambia; and still have not been issued in Malawi
Finding 3:

**National crop production estimates are in some countries increasingly unreliable**

- Why important? Crop production and demand estimates guide government trade decisions, marketing board behavior, WFP local procurement, etc,
- Evidence of political factors creeping in
  - example: Malawi, 2007/08 and 2008/09

Nominal USD maize prices, retail Lilongwe, Malawi
Nominal USD maize prices, retail Lilongwe, Malawi

- Import parity from South Africa
- Government export contract
- Blantyre-Lunzu, southern Malawi

New York Times front page article
Nominal USD maize prices, retail Lilongwe, Malawi

Finding 4:

Opportunities to relieve maize deficits and stabilize prices are hindered by regional trade barriers

- Tanzania, Zambia, Malawi all have export bans
- Various trade impediments that raise costs to consumers and reduce prices to farmers
Finding 5:

*Decline in fertilizer use on staple crops in the region in 2008.*
Fertilizer price trends

Maize-fertilizer price ratios, Kenya
Finding 5:

Decline in fertilizer use on staple crops in the region in 2008. Anticipated outcomes:

1. less fertilizer used on maize and other crops in the coming cropping season
2. lower 2009 yields and production
3. continued upward pressure on maize prices

What to do:

1. Focus on reducing costs in distributing fertilizer to farmers
2. Focus on helping farmers to improve efficiency of fertilizer use
Profitability of using fertilizer (Value Cost Ratio):

\[
\text{Farm-gate Maize Price} \quad \Delta \text{kg maize} \\
\text{---------------------------------- * ------------} \\
\text{Farm-gate Fertilizer Price} \quad \Delta \text{kg fert}
\]

Upshot on smallholder behavior:

- **Short run**: A small minority of relatively better-off farmers will be able to take advantage of higher food prices
  1. Most smallholders, who are net buyers of food, and urban consumers, will be worse off
  2. Reduction in incentives to use fertilizer → yields down → increasingly likelihood of needing to import in 2009
  3. Shifts in cropping patterns toward staple food (including roots and tubers), away from export crops

- **Longer-run**: could be positive for Africa if accompanied by supportive public investments and policies
Implications for food security policy?

The outcomes in E/S Africa will be influenced greatly by political response:

1. How seriously governments and donors commit to smallholder agriculture
   1. Not just how much to spend on agriculture, but how the funds are spent
   2. Commitment to support the development of markets
   3. Commitment to public goods investments

2. US/EU/WFP policy toward flexible food aid response (cash vs. food depending on situation)

3. US energy policy

4. US/EU agricultural and trade subsidy policies

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>- 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 for government and donor response
Budget allocation to Agricultural Sector in Zambia: ZMK465 million in 2005

- Personnel Emoluments 20%
- Operational funds 11%
- Irrigation Development 3%
- Infrastructure 2%
- Food Security Pack & EDRP 12%
- Food Reserve Agency Maize Marketing 15%
- Fertilizer Support Program 37%

Source: Govereh et al, 2006

Export bans and trade restrictions

- Generally doesn’t stop trade from occurring but raising smuggling costs, which depress prices for farmers and raise costs for consumers
- Fact: only 5% of all grain imported by Africa countries comes from other African countries – 95% of imports is grown by farmers on other continents
Export bans and trade restrictions

• Generally doesn’t stop trade from occurring but raising smuggling costs, which depress prices for farmers and raise costs for consumers

• Fact: only 5% of all grain imported by Africa countries comes from other African countries – 95% of imports is grown by farmers on other continents

Alternative models of staple food market development to guide ACTESA and CAADP Pillar 2 implementation:

Model 1

Market primacy -- success not dependent on state action
- public goods investment
- institutional strengthening
- policies supportive of private sector entry and competition

Model 2

Market primacy - state role limited to but dependent on state commitment to
- Buffer stocks
- Marketing board floor and ceiling prices / stabilization
- Input subsidy and credit programs
- rules-based policy interventions

Model 3

Market primacy -- but major role for direct state operations in markets
- Buffer stocks
- Marketing board floor and ceiling prices / stabilization
- Input subsidy and credit programs
- rules-based policy interventions

Model 4

State-led marketing model (1980s)
- based on arguments about Asia and 1970-80s in E/S Africa
- private sector will not serve farmers in remote areas
- market failures ubiquitous
### Possible Response Options for Consideration:

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Good harvest</th>
<th>Production shortfall</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response options for governments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Income support (food for work, cash transfers) for vulnerable groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Production contracts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• local food purchase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• build cash reserves for import when needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response options for regional initiatives (e.g. Pillar 2 of CAADP)</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>• Production contracts</td>
<td>• seek imported food aid, not local purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• local food purchase</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
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Response options for regional initiatives (e.g. Pillar 2 of CAADP)

• Support improved crop production estimates and market information
• Support overhaul of food balance sheet approach
• support for infrastructural improvements (road, rail, ports, communications)
• support for credit guarantees for private investment in storage facilities

Summing Up

1. Despite up/down gyrations, world prices likely to remain at higher mean levels than in past
2. Short run distributional effects: relatively few will gain – many will lose
3. Long-run opportunities for Africa are positive, but whether these opportunities are captured depends on governance
   -- political responses will greatly influence outcomes
   -- can a coalition be formed to use public resources in ways that would contribute to equitable development?
   -- from where will this coalition emerge?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>period</th>
<th>Ag. Growth rate (FAO)</th>
<th>AgGDP (WB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1990-2006</td>
<td>+3.26</td>
<td>+5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>1990-2006</td>
<td>+4.76</td>
<td>+5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1990-2006</td>
<td>+2.15</td>
<td>+2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>1990-2006</td>
<td>+1.41</td>
<td>+2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>1990-2006</td>
<td>+2.98</td>
<td>+3.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

thank you
Kilograms of maize capable of being purchased per daily wage rate for Zambian government employees

Farm size distribution:
Small farm sector

Source: Jayne, Mather, Mghenyi, 2006
Smallholder Households’ Position in the Maize Market

Characteristics of smallholder farmers, Zambia 2003/04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</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>31,328 (2%)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>2,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of maize sellers</td>
<td>328,561 (26%)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households not selling maize</td>
<td>907,255 (72%)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Zambia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fertilizer source:</th>
<th>Total Income</th>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Landholding size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Households not acquiring fertilizer:</strong></td>
<td>266</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Govereh et al, 2006
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### 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

### Political economy of public resource allocation

- **Donor budget support**
  - Long-term productive investments: R&D, infrastructure, education, etc.
  - High social payoffs
  - But payoffs come 5-20 later
  - Critical for sustained poverty reduction

- **Government budget**
  - Input subsidies,
  - Marketing board price supports,
  - Land bills

- Immediate political payoffs;
  - Visible support to constituencies
  - Contribution to sustained growth / poverty reduction is unclear