

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF MOZAMBIQUE
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE AGRICULTURAL
POLICY DOCUMENTS PRESENTED AT THE
JULY 1986 SADCC MEETING IN HARARE

MAPUTO
August, 1986

1. INTRODUCTION.

At the SADCC meeting in Harare in July of 1986 the nine member countries presented a series of documents outlining national food and agriculture sector policies and strategies. These documents are compared in this note with a view to trace basic areas of comparability and difference. The objective of this exercise is to provide background information for the re-examination of the regional food and agriculture sector strategy and programmes, which are presently being pursued by the SADCC countries.

2. METHODOLOGY AND FOCUS.

The nine papers vary both in approach and detail. Some papers focus on long term issues and goals, whereas others have a short or medium term horizon. Terms like policies and strategies are at times used interchangeably, and overall objectives, more specific targets and policy measures (instruments) are not always clearly distinguished. These factors make comparative analysis more difficult.

An attempt is made in tables 1 and 2 to identify and classify the overall policy objectives and instruments to which each country document refer.

The terminology (or checklist) which was used in preparing the tables is indicated in annex 1.

No other sources than the nine documents were used in the classification and comparative analysis.

This implies that what may appear as an imperfection in agricultural policy could as well reflect insufficient information in the country paper, or - of course - inadequacies in the interpretation given to it here.

Furthermore, the analysis is limited to a comparison of stated objectives and policy instruments, without entering into issues

like resourcebase, present economic situation, agriculture's role and importance in the economy, etc., which are also discussed in most of the country documents.

It follows that the focus in this note is on stimulating discussion and further review of policy objectives and measures rather than trying to provide comprehensive summaries of country papers.

3. COMPARATIVE TABLES.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide summary information on respectively overall policy objectives and instruments, country by country. The wording in the tables come from the country papers.

None of the country documents enter into the issues of possible trade-offs between conflicting policy objectives, and the documents are also short of information on the many constraints which may in practice limit the scope of feasible policy action.

Furthermore, the exact interpretation of a particular policy objective such as "employment" may vary among countries, and the documents do not provide the necessary specifications to trace in detail such differences. Finally, policy instruments may be classified in various ways. The approach used here i. e., to group policy measures in an arbitrary but consistent manner according to the nature of the instruments themselves, is therefore not the only feasible one.

PF 9

4. OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS.

4.1. Policy objectives.

i) Transformation.

Three countries (Angola, Mozambique and Tanzania) clearly aim at transforming their societies in a socialist direction, whereas four countries (Botswana, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe) make no statements on this issue. One country (Swaziland) underlines the aim of transforming traditional small scale agriculture into commercial farming. The remaining country (Lesotho) without commenting on overall questions under this heading aims at retaining existing land tenure patterns. It would therefore appear that there are basic differences in the overall aims as regards the organization of future societies. One group is clearly aiming at socialism, and a second group (within which there are some differences) does not disclose its intentions.

ii) Selfsufficiency and selfreliance.

The nine documents reflect general agreement on the aim of achieving selfsufficiency and promote selfreliance. It is obvious, however, that two countries (Malawi and Zimbabwe) are in a somewhat different position than the other seven countries. These two countries wish to maintain their position; Zimbabwe for example wishes to maintain and (only) where appropriate expand agricultural production. The other seven SADCC members struggle at attaining this objective.

iii) Food security and nutrition.

It is clear that all countries aim at food security (Mozambique is the only country where this objective

is not specifically referred to), but the documents are different in that they do not focus on the same aspects of food security. Five countries (Angola, Malawi, Swaziland and Zimbabwe) highlight overall (or national) food security and related food supply systems and nutritional standards. Two countries (Botswana and Tanzania) stress that food security means improving the level of food security and ensuring an acceptable diet for all (i. e., the issue of access to food). Two countries (Lesotho and Mozambique) provide little detail on the food security issue, indicating only improved nutritional status as the objective. Three countries (Botswana, Swaziland and Zambia) refer specifically to rural people's nutritional standard, whereas the remaining countries are more general in this regard. It therefore seems that while the food security concept has been well defined in the regional strategy, aims may differ in practice.

iv) Equity and income distribution.

In general all SADCC documents express concern with equity and incomedistribution issues of the development process. However, the documents differ in that they do not put the same emphasis on absolute and relative aspects of this overall objective. One country (Tanzania) refers to absolute poverty only. Two countries (Angola and Mozambique) focus on basic (absolute) needs, although some concern with relative distribution aspects are expressed in that they refer to rural (as opposed to urban) people in particular. Three countries (Malawi, Swaziland and Zambia) are primarily concerned with relative rural/urban differentials.

Two countries (Lesotho and Zimbabwe) are concerned with

both absolute and relative aspects with emphasis on the latter, and one country (Botswana) aims at growth with equity.

Finally, the documents also differ in their emphasis on equity among individuals or between sectors (rural/urban). Reference to equity among men and women is only made in the Lesotho document.

v) Employment.

Three countries (Angola, Malawi and Mozambique) have not indicated increased employment as an objective, and in the remaining documents it is not explicit whether employment is being pursued for its own sake or for its impact on production and/or income distribution. Three countries (Botswana, Tanzania and Zimbabwe) wish to generate or maximize employment in general, whereas it for three other countries (Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia) is particularly to the rural population that this objective refers. There is therefore a pronounced difference in how this objective is treated, and three basic approaches could be identified (i. e. not referred to , a general goal and a means to improve the lot of rural people).

vi) Balance of payment.

Two countries (Botswana and Lesotho) do not indicate balance of payment objectives, whereas all other countries aim at strengthening their balance of payment position. This appears, therefore, in general as an important goal. There are, however, differences in how this goal is phrased. Three countries (Malawi, Swaziland and Zimbabwe) stress the wish to increase exports, whereas four countries (Angola, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia) in addition pursue, a goal of

decreasing imports. No country focus exclusively on import issues. Three approaches to balance of payment goals could therefore be identified (i. e. not referred to, export promotion and a combination of export promotion and import substitution/control).

vii) Environment.

While protection of the environment is referred to by a number of countries this objective does not appear very important in general. Three countries (Angola, Mozambique and Tanzania) do not indicate environmental objectives, and for at least one more country (Malawi) it appears that this goal is pursued more as a means to increased production than for its own sake. The remaining countries (Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe) make more or less similar statements on the wish to protect the natural habitat, with Lesotho being the only country for which this appears as a major preoccupation.

viii) Final remarks

It may be stated that the above review has identified main areas of difference and similarity as far as agricultural policy objectives among SADCC countries is concerned. It is stressed again, however, that the review is based on the documents presented.

A number of objectives or goals which are stated in other documents (such as the Declaration of Principles and Programmes of Action of the World Conference of Agrarian Reform and Rural Development held in 1979) have not been discussed, as they are not referred to in the nine documents. The most conspicuous example is the integration of women in development.

4.2. Policy instruments.

i) Legal and institutional.

Three countries (Botswana, Malawi and Zimbabwe) make little reference to instruments in this group. The remaining countries comment on land tenure, promotion of farmers' associations, cooperatives, etc., the balance between various social sectors and agricultural planning institutions. The only major point - about which there is general agreement - is to stress the importance of the traditional small holder (peasant sector). However, the importance of other sectors is highlighted as well, and cannot be overlooked (Angola, Mozambique, Swaziland, Tanzania and Zambia).

The documents from Swaziland, Tanzania and Zambia make particular reference to the private (commercial) enterprise sector, whereas Angola and Mozambique focus more on the role of the state enterprise planned sector.

ii) Macro-economic.

All countries proposed macro-economic policy measures, although they vary in character. There is a clear similarity in the attention given to price policy. Only two countries (Angola and Botswana) do not specifically refer to this area, and there is a common line in recognizing the importance of price incentives to the producers. However, statements on the practical implementation varies from noting the existence of systems for guaranteed producer prices (Zimbabwe and Swaziland) through suggesting that more favourable price incentives are needed (Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique and Tanzania) to Zambia's approach with complete decontrol of prices. A more or less similar picture exists when it comes to agricultural credit, although not only Zambia, but also

countries like Swaziland and Tanzania stress that credit is to be given on strict commercial terms.

The documents reflect SADCC countries preoccupation with public and private investments. Some countries (Botswana and Zambia) have introduced a number of measures such as tax concessions on capital costs, interest rate subsidies etc. Mozambique is proposing to rationalize the investment process and support foreign investment, and as many as seven countries (Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe) foresee various public investment, including in particular roads, irrigation, processing and marketing. Growth, more or less explicitly linked with investments, is another area which attract considerable attention, but the practical measures vary again considerably. Two countries (Angola and Mozambique) focus on support to regions or sectors where quick response using existing capacity is feasible. One country (Tanzania) approach the subject through public investments and the priority assigned to agriculture, and yet other countries (Botswana, Malawi, Swaziland and Zambia) concentrate on establishing a growth (commercial) climate. Lesotho in addition to developing incentives for producers also stress the importance of expanding trading links with other nations (trade as dynamic element).

The need to improve marketing systems is noted in several documents. One country (Angola) focus exclusively on availability of consumer goods, inputs, etc. This is also a preoccupation to Mozambique, which in addition proposes to improve marketing and transport in general, which is more in line with Lesotho, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

iii) Crop protection and production.

This group of policy measures is characterized by a relatively higher degree of uniformity.

It stands out that general attention is given to the need for adaptive, applied agricultural research focusing on small farmer needs and farming systems. Linkages to extension are referred to more or less directly in most documents, and all countries without exception refer to extension and training efforts.

The use and delivery of improved seeds, fertilizers and pesticides is a preoccupation equally shared by all, and measures range from subsidizing input prices (Botswana and Lesotho) through basic investments such as laboratories, service centres, depots and other improvements (Angola, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia) to fostering local production of agricultural inputs (Zimbawé). In the field of agricultural mechanization the picture is more mixed, and most countries which refer to this issue use a combination of promoting increased moterization (Angola, Swaziland and Zambia) and draught power (Angola, Tanzania and Zambia).

The documents refer with varying degree of detail to various other measures which are directly linked to the objective of increased production and food security. Six countries (Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Swaziland, Tanzania and Zambia) support development of irrigation, and the same six countries (except Mozambique) discuss grain reserves and early warning systems. The latter subject is also referred to in the documents from Lesotho and Malawi.

Pest and disease control, better storage and other post harvest measures are referred to by four countries

(Angola, Botswana, Swaziland and Tanzania). The attention given by five countries (Angola, Botswana, Swaziland, Tanzania and to a slightly lesser degree Zambia) to the three groups of measures mentioned here is clear; whereas Zimbabwe makes no comments and Lesotho, Malawi and Mozambique comment on only one out of the three groups.

The last group of policy measures to be mentioned are the regional (integrated) development programmes. It would appear that four countries (Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia) and possibly Angola focus on this approach, but little detail is provided on experiences obtained.

iv) Soil and water conservation and land utilization.

This group of measures has received little attention in the country documents in general. The only clear exception is Lesotho. Malawi and Swaziland provide some detail, whereas the remaining countries (Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe) provide either none or only one reference to this subject. These individual references concern in four out of five documents a study or the definition of a strategy.

v) Livestock production and animal disease control.

While this group does not receive as much attention as macro-economic and crop production and protection measures it is clear that it is one of the major areas of concern. Only one country (Zambia) does not in one way or the other refer to this group of measures.

The development of small species and diversification in general is proposed by five countries (Angola,

Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique and Swaziland). Re-establishment and development of veterinary services is proposed by seven countries (Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zimbabwe) Livestock breeding, range productivity, animal nutrition and improved management practices in general are other measures proposed in between two and four documents.

vi) Fisheries.

Very little attention is given to measures in this field. Five countries (Angola, Lesotho, Swaziland, Tanzania and Zambia) provide no comments at all, and comments made by other countries (Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and Zimbabwe) are very scanty.

vii) Wildlife.

Very little attention is given to measures in this field. Only two countries (Malawi and Zimbabwe) provide scanty comments.

viii) Forestry.

Very little attention is given to measures in this field. Only three countries (Lesotho, Malawi and Mozambique) provide comments, and these are scanty.

ix) Other.

Among other measures the following observations could be made. Four countries (Botswana, Mozambique, Swaziland and Tanzania) refer to agricultural strategy development. Three countries (Angola, Botswana and Mozambique) highlight manpower promotion and training. Four countries (Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi and Zimbabwe) refer to health, social

and women programmes. One country (Zimbabwe) focus attention on development of road, rail and port systems and complementarity between national and regional efforts.

x) Final remarks

It may be stated that the only areas where clearly uniform measures are referred to in some detail are in the fields of crop production and protection and livestock production and animal disease control. Other areas are characterized either by the little attention they receive or by the non-uniformity of measures.

Annex 1: Methodology (or checklist) used in classifying national agricultural policy papers.

A. Objectives*.

The country documents stress or focus on a combination of the following aspects concerning policy objectives:

1. Changes in the socio-economic, cultural, institutional and other basic characteristics of society (transformation);
2. Selsufficiency and selfreliance in food;
3. Food security (including both physical and economic access to food) and nutrition (diet of appropriate nutritional quality);
4. Equity and incomedistribution;
5. Employment;
6. Balance of payment;
7. Protection of the environment.

While the first point concern the basic organization of society and its institutions, which differs considerably from country to country, the last six points concern the more concrete expressions of social welfare, where greater uniformity in aspiration among countries could be expected.

* Objectives are defined broadly. Therefore, questions of conceptual (theoretical) clarity could be raised. It would, however, be impractical to identify too large a number of objectives.

B. Policy instruments.

Policy instruments may be classified in a number of ways, and their application varies depending upon the socio-economic and political organization of individual countries. It is, however, crucial to identify in a given context which are the key pressure points and instruments of inducing change towards established objectives (which may or may not be expressed in more quantified targets).

The grouping used here reflects on the one hand the need to correspond as much as possible to the sector division in the Lusaka Programme of Action and on the other hand the nature of the instruments themselves.

The following areas are referred to:

1. Legal and institutional measures related to agrarian structures, land tenure, promotion of group farming, cooperatives and collective and state farms (modes of production), land settlements, etc.;
2. Macro-economic policy instruments such as fiscal, monetary, price and income, foreign trade, investment, marketing, consumption and labour policies;
3. Agricultural technology, services, infrastructure, etc., (crop production and protection);
4. Soil and water conservation and land utilization;
5. Livestock production and animal disease control;
6. Fisheries;
7. Wildlife;

8. Forestry

9. Others.