



Value Chain Analysis for Development: providing evidence for better policies and operations in agricultural value chains Brussels 18-19 January 2023

REDUCING TENSIONS BETWEEN SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY IN SMALLHOLDER RAINFED CROPS IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA: INSIGHTS FROM 6 VCA4D STUDIES



Alistair Sutherland and Ricardo Villani





Questions

#### TENSIONS BETWEEN SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY – IN SMALLHOLDER RAINFED CROP VALUE CHAINS

- 1. What are the main environmental and social impacts in these VCs (based VCA4D methodology)?
- 2. What are the main trade-offs, or tensions, between social sustainability and environmental sustainability in these VCs?
- **3.** What options are there for reducing the impact of these trade-offs: win-win options?
- 4. Implications for policy and programme support?

#### List of VCA4D studies used

Onumah, G., Plaisier, C., Villani, R., Komlaga, G., 2020, **Sorghum Value Chain Analysis in Ghana**. Report for the European Union, DG-DEVCO. Value Chain Analysis for Development Project (VCA4D CTR 2016/375-804), 167 p

Onumah, G., Dhamankar, M., Ponsioen, T., Bello, M., (2021), **Maize Value Chain Analysis in Nigeria**. Report for the European Union, INTPA/F3. Value Chain Analysis for Development Project (VCA4D CTR 2016/375-804), 155p

Fusillier J-L, Sutherland A., Villani R., Chapoto A., 2021. **Maize Value Chain Analysis in Zambia**. Report for the European Union, DG-INTPA Value Chain Analysis for Development Project (VCA4D CTR 2016/375-804), 222p

Kleih, U., Bosco, S., Kumar, R., Apeeliga, J., Lalani, B., Yawlui, S., 2020, **Groundnuts Value Chain Analysis in Ghana**. Report for the European Union, DG-DEVCO. Value Chain Analysis for Development Project (VCA4D CTR 2016/375-804), 150p + annexes.

Fok, M., Meier, M., Nicolay, G., Balarabe, O., Calaque, R., 2019. Cotton value Chain Analysis in Cameroon. Report for the European Union, DG-DEVCO. Value Chain Analysis for Development Project (VCA4D CTR 2016/375-804), 122p

Nicolay, G; Estur, G; Walsh, C; Desalegn, P, 2020. **Cotton Value Chain Analysis in Ethiopia**. Report for the European Union, DG-DEVCO. Value Chain Analysis for Development Project (VCA4D CTR 2016/375-804), 128 p



Maize – food staple – public investment (subsidies)

**Cotton** – private investment in processing – smallholder services for Cameroon

**Groundnuts** – food crop – limited public investment. **Sorghum** – food staple in north & brewing – limited public investment

### **SMALLHOLDER VC CONTEXT- RAINFED FIELD CROPS**



Production mainly reliant on household labour (including women and children)

- Medium to high production risks climatic, pest and diseases
- Lower input, more extensive
- Geographically extended input supply and crop marketing networks weak bargaining position of smallholders,
- Historical reliance on government research and extension services, "Customary/Traditional" land tenure and land-use systems



### SMALLHOLDER VC CONTEXT - POST FIELD PRODUCTION $\sqrt[7]{3}$

- Smaller-scale processing enterprises, adding value important for many rural households
- Small-scale processing operations in urban and peri-urban households especially women

Artisanal brewing site in Northern Ghana (malted sorghum beverage processing)



Sorghum VC: environmental impact per life cycle stage of artisanal and industrial brewing (inventory data based on industry-wide averages for clear beer production)



### Main Social and Environmental Impacts - 1



#### MAIN POINTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

- Land use (crop cultivation, clearing of new land/deforestation, biodiversity)
- Global warming potential, mainly derived from land use change
- Particulate matter formation (unhealthy local processing methods)
- Toxicity and ecotoxicity (unsafe use of agro-chemicals)
- Soil health depletion

#### MAIN POINTS OF SOCIAL IMPACT

- Gender inequality (household decision making on land access, women's workloads, crop choice, crop use/disposal, access to credit and technical advice)
- Household food and nutrition security
- Social capital low levels rural communities

### Main trade-offs – Cultivation of grains- 1

- (√)
- Social reproduction of small-scale farming households is a way of life which typically requires continuous cultivation using low levels of external inputs to meet household food and nutrition needs, resulting in negative environmental impacts:
  - Low input extensive cultivation potentially increases environmental impact (land use change and occupation causing reduction of carbon stock and of biodiversity).

 Where land for growing food crops is scarce, customary land tenure systems enable households to more easily move to where there is more land available:

- Land clearing for cultivation negatively impacts the environment (contributes to climate change due to soil and biomass C loss, reduces biodiversity)
- it also reduces the availability of wood for fuel and construction in the medium term.

### Main trade-offs – Cultivation of grains - 2



- There are technologies which do reduce the labour burden for women and children (mainly hand weeding), but have negative environmental impact:
  - Burning of crop residues helps to reduce competition from weeds and pests and adds patches of soil fertility, but has negative environmental impacts (emissions of particulate matter),
  - Use of fertilizer and herbicides carry some environmental risks (in the longer term fertilizer use may reduce soil quality; suspected links between herbicide use and human health)
  - Use of fertilizer and herbicides enable higher levels of production per unit area, which may have a positive environmental impacts (potential reduction of cropland expansion into virgin land).
- Use of external inputs can reduce female labour burden, but low levels of social capital in rural areas limits access to affordable inputs and reliable markets for produce –
  - Low input extensive production methods are a less risky option for small-scale farmers but with higher environmental impact (especially in cases where the pressure on virgin land for cropland expansion is high).

#### Main trade-offs – Processing stage of Grain VCs



- Processing grains for food and beverages both for household use and for sale is very important for rural women, and particularly and female headed household livelihoods – but negatively impacts the environment and in some cases human health:
  - Consumes firewood and charcoal, negatively impacting the environment (Carbon loss and biodiversity decrease caused by forest degradation due to fuelwood collection),
  - Groundnut roasting / artisanal brewing of malted grains beverages in confined conditions has a negative environmental impact (respiratory health risks due to particulate matter emissions in the site of fuelwood combustion mainly impacting women doing the processing).
- Post-harvest grain loss grains and aflatoxins (groundnuts) negatively impact household food and nutrition:

Indirectly increases environmental impact as more land is cultivated to make up for these losses. Maize – PH Loss (%) in Ghana, Nigeria and Zambia: 17 to 18% in 2021 Source: African Postharvest Losses Information System (APHLIS)

## Main trade-offs – Smallholder Cotton VCs



- Smallholder cotton generally impacts the environment due to land-use effects,
  - Small-holder low input extensive cultivation methods compared with higher input cultivation methods potentially increases environmental impact (due to the lower yield per hectare)

#### • Smallholder cotton can assist with aspects of social sustainability:

- Household food security improved indirectly; through improved soil fertility for food crops, income for purchase of food,
- Income used for welfare benefits (health, education),
- Risk reduction (crop diversification to reduce climate, pest and market risks),
- Social capital, local infrastructure and political stability (N. Cameroon case),
- Household food security improved indirectly; through improved soil fertility for food crops, income for purchase of food.
- Commercial cotton mono-culture carries more local environmental risks longer term than smallholder cotton (Ethiopia)

## Options for reducing the impact of trade-offs-1 $\sqrt[1]{12}$

#### WIN-WINs:

# Integrated approach to supporting smallholder production and marketing, including:

- Lower level intensification using improved inputs (seeds, seed dressing, fertilizer and herbicides at adequate rates) - provided on time and affordable,
- Locally tailored technical advice (elements of conservation agriculture, post-harvest practices, local processing),
- Labour saving technology to reduce female labour burden (improved tools, herbicides at adequate rates),
- Quality standards for produce (e.g. aflatoxin identification),
- Social contracts (with input suppliers and traders),
- Gender sensitive extension education ("household approach"),
- Minimise culture of free "hand-outs" and unsustainable subsidies,
- **Smallholder cotton** Support (technical advice, inputs, market options, group formation) for fuller integration with food-crops and "adding on" other cash crops.

# To reduce the negative environmental impact of low input extensive cultivation while improving social sustainability.

## Options for reducing the impact of trade-offs-2

#### WIN-WINs:

Measures to reduce loss of tree cover (and biodiversity) and to improve human health outcomes arising from harmful practices during grain processing:

- Support for planting of trees on farm holdings (boundary planting, woodlots, appropriate agroforestry species),
- Promotion of energy saving technology for household cooking and local processing activities (more efficient stoves or ovens),
- Loans for purchase of small scale processing technology, particularly energy saving.



Traditional charcoal stove (left) and a fuel saving stove being promoted in Zambia (right)



Pito brewing sites in Ghana. energy-saving brewing site (A), pile of firewood for brewing (B), below: open-fire brewing site (C).

#### Implications for investment in smallholder rainfed crop VCs $\sqrt[6]{10}$

- Decisions informed by good understanding of the investment context for smallholder service delivery (balance of public and private involvement - current priorities and future opportunities) in any rainfed crop value chain being considered,
- Investment "conditions", and advice, relating to social and environmental sustainability in public-private investment partnership agreements.
- Continue Investment in strengthening social capital in rural areas;
  - Capacity within communities, and
  - Trust between producers and other key stakeholders (input suppliers, traders),
- Question use of public funds to support unsustainable input subsidies, more creative and sustainable subsidy strategy,
- Encouraging alternative use of Agriculture budget for support of high quality research, advisory and regulatory services which benefit small-holders,
- Give consideration to investment in smallholder cotton programmes which offer win-wins for social and environmental impact,
- Creative policies to reduce deforestation and improve tree cover combined with support for in-field conservation and planting of trees on family land holdings (woodlots, boundaries),
- Investment in promotion of energy saving methods for food processing,
- Investment in promotion of affordable post-harvest loss reduction technology.





Value Chain Analysis for Development: providing evidence for better policies and operations in agricultural value chains

> CONFERENCE 8 and 19 January 2023 Brussels & Online

Thank you for your attention!

https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/value-chain-analysis-for-development-vca4d-/events/conference-value-chainanalysis-development-providing-evidence-better-policies-and-operations