



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

AGRICULTURAL RESTRUCTURING IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

**Papers presented at an
International Symposium
held at Swakopmund, Namibia**

24-27 July, 1990

Edited by

**Csaba Csáki
Theodor Dams
Diethelm Metzger
Johan van Zyl**

**International Association of Agricultural Economists
in association with
Association of Agricultural Economists in Namibia
(AGRECONA)**

First published in 1992 by the Association of Agricultural Economists of Namibia

P.O. Box 21554, Windhoek, Namibia.

© International Association of Agricultural Economists.

This book is copyright. Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of private study, research, criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright Act, no part may be reproduced by any process without written permission. Enquiries should be made to the publisher.

Printed in Namibia by Windhoek Printers & Publishers (Pty) Ltd,
P.O. Box 1707, Windhoek, Namibia.

Distributed by the Association of Agricultural Economists of Namibia,
P.O. Box 21554, Windhoek, Namibia.

ISBN 99916/30/10/4

TOWARD RURAL RECONSTRUCTION IN MOZAMBIQUE: REFLECTIONS FOR NAMIBIA

R H Green

INTRODUCTION - THE PDP AND MOZAMBIQUE

This paper sketches the broad goals, strategies and some components of Mozambique's Priority District Programme (PDP) as they may relate to Namibia. The PDP is one of two main priorities in the reconstruction of rural society, restoration of rural services and rehabilitation of rural livelihoods in Mozambique. The other is the return of internally and externally displaced war-affected households to their homes and the restoration of livelihoods and civil society for these returnados, and for the rural families who have not fled - but whose homes and production base have been devastated by the South African instigated and managed war of terrorist aggression against Mozambique.

The PDP's approach is perceived as central in six senses:

- creating an opportunity for absolutely poor households (60 to 65% in rural Mozambique including displaced persons) to produce their way to less humanly and socially disastrous levels;
- parallel to and sustained by rehabilitation and broadening of access to basic infrastructure and productive services;
- restoring (achieving) national and rural household food security by increases in both household self-provisioning and commercialised production;
- reflating the severely depressed urban and industrial sectors by expanding rural markets for their potential production;
- contributing to rebuilding of Mozambique's industrial raw material and export bases; and
- strengthening rural sector familial (small household producers) participation in governance both by involving them in decisions on programme design in each district and by recreating a significant set of public services in rural areas for them to be involved in governing via district and provincial assemblies/councils.

Economic - human - equity - political foci

The PDP is an economic (production- and productivity-oriented), human investment (health/education/agricultural knowledge), equity (reduction of absolute poverty/increase in effective access to basic services) and political involvement (in governance and increase in public service provision) oriented approach.

Selection is by the agricultural household sector and district, not by degree of poverty. That is a pragmatic consideration - even Chairman Mao defined the goal of a responsible, effective rural economic strategy as "all boats float higher". This is particularly true in respect to recreating a rural commercial network to sell consumer goods and production/construction inputs, to buy produce and to transport the goods sold and produce purchased to and from points accessible to rural households.

However, the orientation of the programme to the sector familial is also a social, political and economic one. It is ideological in the sense of believing that no nation can be great and prosperous if the majority of its people are poor and miserable. The source of that

premise is Adam Smith. The basis of the PDP's production enhancement is to be from private household production. It is an economic decision because it places the main focus of renewed rural production on small family enterprises, not larger private farms nor private or public sector corporate production units. These are perceived as being too capital, foreign exchange, skilled personnel, technology and middle or high level entrepreneur intensive to be viable/practicable despite their uses as complements or in specific crops (e.g. sugar, tea). Separate programmes to encourage and support them do exist or are envisaged.

Organisational challenges

The PDP is intended to avoid four failings of past rural development efforts in SSA: First, providing a reasonable package of infrastructure and basic services but not, in fact, enabling households to produce and to commercialise significantly more than before. Second, anarchically independent programmes by different ministries so that water, education, health, transport, credit research and extension programmes did not coordinate with each other and, as a result, the whole tended to be less than the sum of its parts. Third, creating separate multi-purpose project or area administrations outside normal governmental structures to by-pass coordination and other bureaucratic problems but creating insoluble accountability, sustainability and conflict with government problems as well as greatly impeding any overall improvement of the excluded main-line service provision administration and governance institutions. Fourth, failing to ask the intended rural beneficiaries about their needs, possibilities and practices before design, to secure comment and approval of programmes from them or to involve them in monitoring with serious operational attention to their criticisms and suggestions.

AND NAMIBIA?

The primary interest of Mozambique's rural policy to Namibians is in what insights it may provide for how to (or how not to) tackle Namibia's rural reconstruction and development. Namibia is not Mozambique historically, ecologically, politically or in terms of present and potential output mixes. However, there are a number of parallels:

- lack of past orientation of research and extension services to small-scale farmers in respect to crops, livestock or forestry with a resultant lack of adequate knowledge of African rural household income and expenditure, gender, intra-household budgetary, time use, seasonal and other characteristics (slightly alleviated in Namibia by non-governmental studies);
- devastation of the small-scale rural household sector by war;
- weak basic service provision in rural areas, worsened by war;
- pre-independence settler sector dominance in commercialised production with a substantial, specialised network of public and private support service and marketing structures (since collapsed in Mozambique);
- lack of state capacity to hold together the medium- and large-scale commercial agricultural sector if proprietors left (e.g. the North Central abandoned ranches in SWA as it then was);
- the near total immediate post-independence dependence of the agricultural support, service and marketing structures on middle and high level personnel of European ancestry and - therefore - the importance of the proportion of these personnel choosing to remain (catastrophically low - at most 10% - in Mozambique);

- the need to achieve social, physical and economic rehabilitation after war for rural households comprising a substantial proportion of the total rural population (300 000 dislocated persons in Namibia according to CCN estimates plus perhaps 40 000 of the returning refugees or 20% of Namibia's total population of 1 750 000;¹
- lack of food security for many rural households and the fragility of national food security;
- severe limitations on initial numbers of, and training capacity for agricultural (including livestock) extension and support personnel for broad access, small farming household service provision (and of field and user tested knowledge and techniques for them to extend);
- limited state resources for rural development as a result of transition (specific costs are flight of settlers and war in Mozambique and reconciliation costs of not cutting bloated pay-rolls and pay-levels and servicing debts of the illegal administration in Namibia);
- restoring physical security in rural areas;
- an initial state administrative and bureaucratic structure of great complexity and formalism which relates and communicates with great difficulty to scattered households with low levels of education, because historically it was not concerned with their well-being and interpreted governance as meaning top down rule.

PRIORITY DISTRICT PROGRAMME: TOWARD RECONSTRUCTION AND TRANSFORMATION

Goals and outline of content

The **goals** are to restore **rural production** - primarily in the sector familial - and **economic viability** as well as **rural civil society**. By so doing, the PDP will constitute a major component of Mozambique's economic rehabilitation and make other components - notably urban food security and resuscitation of domestic demand for manufactured goods - practicable. To focus on revival of familial sector output and access to services posits:

- **broad base programmes** - e.g. access to improved seed and basic tools - are more important than limited access, capital intensive projects, because neither technically nor with financial and import constraints can there be enough of the latter to include the majority of the sector familial households;
- **commercialisation** (households have basic needs meeting which requires cash) requires rehabilitation of enterprise/entrepreneurial and physical/infrastructural elements of the **rural commercial network**;
- **food security** for most households depends primarily on their own production, specific attention must be paid to facilitating expansion of household provisioning (subsistence) production and its more efficient household level processing, storage and preservation;

¹ 1 750 000 is roughly the UNPA/UNIN estimate for the 1990 Namibian population. 700 000 plus registered voters - who on known age structure can hardly exceed 40% of population - also suggests roughly 1 750 000. (That assumes eligible but non-registered persons were of the same order of numbers as registered South African residents and registered UNITA plus RSA auxiliary unit combatant/dependents/camp followers - perhaps 34 000 in each case).

- because they increase quantity, quality and effectiveness of labour for direct production - and are basic to political and social sustainability - primary and adult **education**, basic **health** and pure **water** supply (human and livestock) are crucial;
- specific programme by programme attention to **women's needs** and the **actual gender division of labour** in order to allow women to produce more while lightening - or at least not augmenting - their very heavy workload.

Sector familial household priorities

The priorities of poor sector familial households can be summarised under five heads: **Security**; **Economic** and **Social Survival Safety Nets**; **Livelihood**; **Basic Services**; and **Infrastructure** for the above.

These priorities have rarely been studied systematically and operationally - and almost never at national level nor in the context of a planning exercise whether in Mozambique or elsewhere. As a result very ill designed and/or cost inefficient (in the sense of benefits to rural households per unit of resources used) programmes and institutions can be designed, launched and continued with apparent rural support (or at least without major disapproval) even with a participatory political process responsible to a rural majority. A clear example is Tanzania. Tanzania's political process has a clear pro-rural political bias demonstrated by resource transfers to the rural sector from urban sector and external sources on a large scale, systematically raising crop prices more rapidly than wages and by reversals of programmes, policies and structures which roused broad, sharp rural criticism. But this has guaranteed neither efficiency in resource use nor a close correlation between rural household priorities and patterns of resource allocation.

The necessity of security

Security is a necessary condition for meeting other basic needs as well as a human need in and of itself. **Physical security** means the achievement and maintenance of peace and the functioning of police and army within enforced guidelines which ensure honest, peaceful rural households need not fear them and can, when necessary, go to them confidently for assistance. In the context of the PDP this means that coordination with the Armed Forces is crucial.

Socio-political/administrative security means achieving a context in which there are known, broadly acceptable, relatively stable legal, administrative and political frameworks. That context allows people to act in confidence that they will not be messed about with and can expect support if they go about their business/livelihood/family life in ways which they consider socially and politically acceptable. In the PDP context this requires retraining/re-educating District Administrators and their staffs to give top priority to communication with and service to rural households (or poor urban ones in primarily urban districts). Unfortunately many DA's and staff members (judging by rural criticisms not least during Presidential visits) view their primary duties as filing reports and telling (ordering) people to do what the DA believes (not always correctly) Maputo and/or the Provincial capital wants them to do. Many are averse to involving themselves in the hard work of helping the people and technical service providing personnel to develop the districts. Furthermore in some - not all - districts rural households do say they view administrators as outsiders interested only in their own welfare.

Land security means, to poor rural households, **stable use rights** over enough land of good enough quality to **produce a decent livelihood**. It may or may not mean any widespread desire to own the land in the Western individual, saleable, freehold tenure sense. It usually does mean a desire that use rights can be inherited. In Mozambique there is, in general, enough land for this goal to be met - especially if some empressa and state-run/peasant-farmed scheme land is to be redistributed to the sector familial. There are exceptions. Some peri-urban areas are - as the result of war - hopelessly overcrowded. War-moved households in these areas can have land security only if they can be helped to move back either to their home areas (probably their normal preference) or - if that is impracticable - to other areas with adequate land. Similarly in peri-urban zonas verdes and other limited zones of high quality land (some river margins in otherwise dry areas) there is not enough land for sector familial land security and freedom of access for private plus plantation use. In such cases land security means **giving the sector familial priority**.

Communal land use and communal villages may or may not be consistent with land security as seen by the majority of sector familial households. Only if a broad pre-establishment support base exists (or communal production is one option and household another one without discrimination in support and service access provision against those who choose the latter) will communal initiatives be widely acceptable. If large-scale social (work team) production has not been practised there are grave reasons to doubt grouped or combined units, using existing methods, will raise output in more than a minority of cases. Ex-employees of larger units may be exceptions. **Villagisation** in the social and residential sense, if properly explained and supported by provision of better water, health, education, commercialisation and communication/transport access to villages, will frequently be popular and objections will not turn primarily on land security. However, compulsory villagisation in Tanzania, although decided on after a democratic process and with a sector familial majority in the Party Congress taking the decision, was strongly opposed (largely, but not wholly, because of serious communication and implementation debacles at Regional and District political and administrative levels) by perhaps 25% of rural households. This was the case despite access to education, health, water and communication improving. 15 years later support is much broader. The villages remain. There is no barrier to people leaving them, so their survival is evidence of broad acceptance.

Security from exploitation (or security of fair returns) implies price, fee and tax policies which are **broadly perceived as fair**. This does not mean no profits for traders and transporters, but it does mean household terms of trade which are seen as providing a fair day's work earns a fair reward and that a fair year's work provides a decent household income. Nor does it mean no user fees and service charges but it does forbid ones which - as operated - effectively deny access to large numbers of poor households. (In some districts the present rural health consultation and drug fees are seen as fair but in others - with much lower cash incomes - they are perceived as unfair and exclusionary.) Nor are taxes as such viewed as unfair - at least not if services, including security, are being provided. However, for historic reasons, high crop or poll taxes are likely to be seen as exploitation and should be avoided in favour of indirect taxes on urban goods purchased by rural households.

Survival security

Survival safety nets relate primarily to access to food, to ability to stay on the

land, to access to medical services and to avoidance of crushing debt overhangs. They can in part be met at household level (e.g. food reserves and cash reserves). But for absolutely poor households emerging from a war context, household resources and reserve building capacity are very low and for the 50% of rural Mozambican households which are destitute (deslocados, afectados, retornados, amnestados, newly liberated area residents) present capacity to provide them is basically nil. Therefore, concentration in the PDP must be on the public sector provision.

Food security requires that food be physically available and affordable. In deslocado camps that does mean free ration distribution. Generally it is more complex. The PDP should seek to increase local purchases and fair (not subsidised) price commercial network sales reducing dependence on food aid and food handouts and helping rebuild the commercial network. To do that, it needs to use its **rural works programme to augment rural household incomes seasonally, for very low income households and during crises** (e.g. drought, flood) **periods and their aftermath** to the next sound harvest. Whether the work is paid in food, in cash or in a combination depends on local and national contexts (especially whether the rural commercial network has food to sell) and (unfortunately) on donor preferences since many have a bias toward paying in food not metacais to buy it. In the case of destitute households free food is needed until the household can re-establish its production base i.e. 6 to 15 months if the first harvest is sound and 18 to 27 if it is drought (or flood or insect) ravaged.

Ability to stay on the land is separable from food security for survival. If **food is available but only in towns or at camps, households must leave their farms**. The social and economic cost of such forced moves is high and relocation problems inevitably delay post-drought household income rehabilitation. In a peacetime context large-scale migration to relief food is evidence of inadequate food security programming.

Access to medical services is needed to avert crises caused by deaths and common, simply curable, life threatening conditions. It includes availability of vaccination capacity, some simple techniques/supplies (e.g. for oral rehydration) and - in some contexts - certain specialised drugs. APE's (community based auxiliary health workers) and dispensaries plus backup, mobile crisis services (e.g. for vaccinations) are needed for this security.

Livelihood building

Access to a decent livelihood for the sector familial means ability to produce for household use and for sale. It also includes access to wage employment for some household members. It comprises security because without ability to go about one's daily work in safety from violence and arbitrary interference there can be no ability to earn a decent livelihood. Secure land use rights are basic to ability to produce. It comprises the existence of survival safety nets - one cannot earn a decent livelihood if one is no longer alive.

Livelihood restoration/strengthening

Livelihood falls into two analytically separate but interrelated components:

- household production of food, housing and fuel for own use;
- cash income (from sale of crops, fish, livestock, forest produce, processed foods and artisanal products or services and also from employment incomes of family members who may or may not be resident in the rural household i.e. it may and historically often

has included remittances).

The mix of these components varies widely. In much of Southern and Central Mozambique remittance incomes from household members working in South Africa, on plantations or in Lorenzo Marques (as it then was) and Beira have traditionally been crucial to rural household economies. A substantial number of Northern Mozambican household economies were crucially dependent on remittances earned in Tanganyika (as it then was). Similarly the nature of cash crops varied - in the South, sector familial production for sale was predominantly food for the Maputo market; in Tete, food for Beira; in the central coastal provinces, cashew and cotton; in the North (where cash sales were lower) food for Beira (via the ports of Pemba and Praia and/or the Lichinga tramway line). Given the low level of education of any kind and low rural cash incomes, it is probable that masonry, carpentry, tool making, blacksmithing, well digging, furniture making, vehicle repair, tailoring and other artisanal services were limited in extent and volume. Seasonal wage employment by sector familial household members primarily engaged in agriculture does not seem to have been common (either absolutely or by comparison with other African countries such as Malawi and Tanzania where for a significant number of households it accounts for - say - 25% of cash and kind household income). Its development (partly but not only by seasonal, labour intensive rural infrastructure rehabilitation and development) should be a **PDP priority**.

Multiple budgets and gender roles

In speaking of household livelihood it is necessary to **avoid** the European social science **assumption of single household budgets** either on the income or expenditure side and also to recognise that **intra-household but inter-budget labour input obligations** (e.g. wife to weeding crops for sale by husband; husband to clearing and sometimes ploughing land for wife to raise household food and marginal sale crops) are often significant.

Most African sector familial households have **at least two budgets - male head of household and wife**. The former includes wage (and remittance) income, artisanal income of the man and sale of 'man's' (i.e. produced primarily for sale) crops - large livestock - fish - main forest products. From it are paid the man's personal expenses (clothing, tobacco, etc.), housebuilding and major repair cash costs, most farming inputs, some 'gifts' (semi-obligatory) to wife or wives and children (e.g. cloth), usually school fees and less uniformly medical (including transport) costs. The woman's budget includes food and fuel produced for household use plus marginal cash sales of those crops, small stock (especially chicken, eggs) and livestock byproduct (e.g. milk) sales, processed food and female artisanal products. The expenditure (cash and kind) obligations are household food and supplies, fuel, women's and children's medical costs and some school fees. Virtually the only single budget cases are likely to be female-headed households without a male member providing regular remittances.

The PDP needs to take gender issues on divisions of labour, of income and of expenditure into account because adequate livelihood requires **balance of each time and income/expenditure budget**. Surpluses on one are not automatically transferred to meet deficits on the other e.g. more male cash income may not significantly improve nutrition if food for the household is a woman's obligation and neither inputs nor time-saving techniques (whether in food production, preservation or preparation or in fuelling, watering, health improvement) are made accessible to women.

Basic human and production services

Access to basic services is a SF need and priority goal as perceived by rural households. The concern is that services be there and financially as well as physically accessible.

If there is to be universal access, that means either no charge for basic human services or simple, point of service waivers of charges for - say - 25% who are so poor they cannot afford them. In present rural conditions no charge may be better because absolute poverty and inability to pay must be 75%-90% in many rural districts when *deslocados*, *afectados*, *retornados*, *amnestados* and newly liberated households are taken into account.

Human services comprise primary health (APE-posto-centro-rural hospital), primary and adult education, and pure drinking water. The PDP needs to have worked out components for each district programme aimed (for 3 years) at restoring past highest levels (usually in 1981-1984 period) and drawing up perspectives for - say - 95% PHC and APE, 80% primary education together with 65% adult literacy and 60% access to pure water by 2000. This needs to be done by the relevant ministries but in a PDP coordinated frame. There is room for community inputs of labour, materials and perhaps cash. How much and in what form needs to be worked out district by district in dialogue with village councils, **not** at centrally imposed levels.

In exploring community-based service support schemes - and even more in setting fees - it is crucial to look at total contribution levels proposed, not to treat each service in isolation. All of the costs (in time, material, food or money) come from the same, predominantly poor, households. Because fee and contribution proposals are devised and put forward independently by would-be recipient institutions this is often ignored in practice.

Extension services should be broadened from crops, livestock, fishery, forestry (assuming all of these now exist at least in principle) to encompass artisanal skills (e.g. building, blacksmithing, tool making, tailoring, furniture making, charcoal, water facility maintenance, vehicle and equipment repair, food processing) plus humanly, socially - and by time saving economically - key topics (e.g. environmental sanitation, water source protection, nutrition).

Commercial service provision

Commercial services are not less basic, crucial or desired/needed by the sector *familial* because they are sold. The Portuguese colonial rural merchanting system was racist and grossly exploitative. But it did provide inputs, credit (however usurious) and "incentive" (i.e. desired consumer) goods to the sector *familial*. Therefore, its collapse (literally flight) and the failure of Agricon ever to achieve a comparable replacement was a tragedy for millions of Mozambicans. The PDP must give priority to reversing that tragedy. Closing that gap is the key to urban food security from domestic sources, input supplies for agro-industries (including textiles), the demand deflation for urban manufactures not rural cash livelihood problems.

The issue is not public versus private in any ideological sense. The public sector is not likely to provide flexible, efficient, small-scale, multi-product commercial services. As Oscar Lange - one of the pioneers in articulating market oriented socialism - pointed out, the small trader, independent artisan and large family farmer do not determine the mode of production and have little reason to undermine an otherwise economically viable and humanly caring mixed or transitional political economy. There is a strong case for multi-channelism

i.e. a public sector presence especially at wholesale level; gradual buildup of co-op (or village) enterprises as perceived demand for and capacity to operate them rises; some "fair price" monitoring analogous to that of the basic food ration network of private retailers and co-ops for limited ranges of basic inputs and consumer goods; a large small to medium size private retail, sub-wholesale and up to provincial level wholesale enterprise component (including buying, storing, transporting and selling).

Private traders will not appear simply because they are allowed to do so and welcomed verbally when (if) they do. They **need access** to:

- shops and godowns;
- an initial stock of goods to sell;
- reliable flows of goods to sell;
- buyers (including Agricon) for produce they buy;
- a reasonably dependable and gradually growing amount to be bought;
- transport (i.e. vehicles repair capacity) usable.

The PDP needs to articulate how these can be supplied. One component is **credit** (for inventories of goods for sale and goods purchased, for restoring premises and godowns, for buying or rehabilitating vehicles). Another is Public Enterprise priority in **supply** of inputs and basic consumer goods at the right time (i.e. tools, seeds and fertiliser are time specific for planting and cultivation seasons and basic consumer goods are most needed and saleable at harvest time). The Agricultural Fondos and the external donors/lenders who want the private sector strengthened are the logical sources of credit.

Small and artisanal goods and services businesses are analogous to commerce. Particular attention needs to be given to avoiding exclusion of women e.g. women and women's co-ops should be favoured, not excluded, from garment making and food processing, input and tool supplying and credit.

Infrastructure rehabilitation

Infrastructure is also a basic need as perceived by the sector familial. Because water supply, schools, clinics, shops, godowns and vehicles have been covered above the dominant component is transport works and the second - where relevant - is infrastructure for small-scale (i.e. SF used) irrigation. Roads, culverts, "boxes", bridges, ditches, drainage pipes, like security, tend to be underrated - until their absence when once they were present underlines their importance. They can be used to build up SF seasonal employment/cash income opportunities, in addition to, and consistent with, their primary purpose of restoring infrastructure.

Broad access programmes

The 21 items listed as **Programmes** (Programme areas) hereafter **could** be called projects. Programme may be a more helpful term because it stresses the need to **serve large numbers** not just a few people; encompasses **policies as well as physical projects**. Each **programme** area (e.g. Health) in fact comprises sub-programmes (e.g. posto/centro rehabilitation, APE revival) each of which includes several projects (each posto, centro, APE unit).

A check-list of programme areas includes: 1-3) education, health and water; 4) roads - bridges - culverts; 5-14) agriculture - land allocation, nutrition/household provisioning, commercialised production, input supply, extension and research, credit,

projects, livestock (including smallstock), forestry/trees, and fishing; 15) agriculture/industry - agroprocessing and artisanal; 16-19) commercial network - buildings, vehicles, goods to sell and working capital; 20) Labour Intensive Works/Employment; 21) Emergencia/Rehabilitacao.

Only a few programmes will be covered here because several have been treated above and because space precludes doing so. It is the overall coverage rather than the programmatic details which are, in most cases, directly relevant to Namibia.

Agriculture

Agriculture - land allocation is basically a policy and administration programme, with some physical aspects in respect to tree felling, bush clearing and/or drainage which are beyond sector familial household capabilities, especially for dislocated and resettled ones. The principle should be to ensure that each sector familial household has secure rights of use over enough land for a home, a home garden, staple own use food production, livestock where mixed or pastoral farming is important and crops (including tree products) to be sold which is adequate to ensure a decent livelihood. How much (1.5 ha to 5 ha excluding grazing seems the likely range) depends on crops and land quality. For settled families the first step is to check whether land already allocated is adequate. It may well be, except for present or past afectados/deslocados huddled for security reasons around towns on ½ to ¼ hectare. The main work is likely to relate to allocating land use rights to resettling afectado, deslocado, retornado and amnestado households and the minority of settled sector familial households who have too little land. This is the first priority - land allocation to private commercial farmers, corporate farms/plantations and in the rare cases of their expansion state farms come **after** SF needs are met.

The issue of land use right allocation to **women** needs to be faced. One household should have one allocation - in the joint names of husband and wife. There should be **no discrimination** in allocation against female-headed households and where the woman is resident and the man working elsewhere, the registration should (if at all practicable and locally acceptable) be in the woman's name. This is the principle of secure land use rights for actual users.

Agriculture - nutrition and household provisioning production has been discussed above. On nutrition, coordination among Agriculture, Health and Commerce is needed. **Baseline estimates**, however rough, on malnutrition (probably, given actual data available, child malnutrition) should be made and **targets** for reducing them set and monitored. This is basic to SF well-being and food security. The primary tasks of Health - Commerce nutrition people are to estimate what quantities of what foods are needed to avoid/reduce malnutrition (at household as well as district level) and to carry out education/extension on use and preparation of foods. But if this is to work, Agriculture must provide parallel extension support and inputs to enable the requisite quantities of the relevant crops to be grown. It may be worth examining household categories to see which ones have special obstacles to raising household provisioning production and what can be done about overcoming them. The goal of **reducing overall female workloads** so they have more time to grow food (and providing inputs and knowledge to raise their outputs to hours used ratio) applies.

Agricultural extension poses a series of challenges:

- **adequate numbers** - ideally 1 technically qualified (certificate or diploma level) person

per 500 households;

- building up a **part-time sector familial based cadre** ideally 1 per 100 households remunerated largely by provision of labour and/or food by their communities in return for time spent demonstrating new techniques/crops and/or facilitating input distribution (with the added incentive that their training should raise their own productivity);
- provision of **transport** (bicycles, motor-cycles plus 1 or 2 Landrover type vehicles per District) so workers are mobile;
- ensuring accurate, usable **data** on crops and techniques as well as on sector familial crop, technique, labour load and seasonal task patterns are 'extended' to the extension staff. This almost certainly implies retraining most present extension cadres; as does
- shifting to emphasise **demonstration** (preferably backed by simple graphic and written materials) with a target of 4 to 5 annual contacts per farm household in groups of 10 to 20 households (about 250 day long demonstrations per year per basic cadre).

Agricultural research for the PDP cannot in the main be original research and certainly not basic research. There is inadequate work in the pipeline and far too short a time for that. What can be done includes:

- identifying known and **field-tested** research results and ensuring these are known to extension personnel;
- seeking to **broaden the base** of "a" by surveying SACCAR and neighbouring state research and extension results (in use by producers not just at research trial level);
- conducting **selective field testing** on domestic research which appears promising as to results but has not been tested under sector familial conditions (e.g. holistic ranching techniques); and selected findings on research applied elsewhere but not in Mozambique secured from IITA (Ibadan), ICRISAT, ICIPE (Nairobi) and IFAD.

The aim of the above exercise (for crops, livestock, fisheries and trees/silviculture) is to produce (more accurately to identify) a body of useful knowledge which can be extended. Over 5 years the results should very substantially increase the value to the sector familial of the extension service and may bring about substantial macro and district as well as household and village level production increases. Over the same period a national agricultural research programme needs to be developed with priorities and targets and with projected resource (especially personnel and finance) requirements and ways to meet them.

Agriculture (Silviculture) - trees and artisanal forestry is an area of considerable importance because of its implications for fuel (household use and commercialised) and for conservation. Mixed farming including trees and bushes for food, fuel, fodder, household provisioning and home construction and sale of fuelwood, poles for building and charcoal has proven a means to improve small farming household living standards under many conditions.

What can be done by the PDP depends on the present data base and extension capacity of Forestry. However, a start can be made quickly in providing seedlings of fast growing indigenous or localised fuel and food crop (e.g. citrus) trees and encouragement of household and village planting. Conservation use of trees (on areas at risk from erosion and lack of wind or water breaks) can be extended/promoted most effectively when the trees are economically valuable as sources of fuel, poles, fodder, food. There is some Tanzanian and Ethiopian experience (including some successes) in this area.

Agriculture - livestock is in broad terms analogous to crops. In many districts cattle, goats and, less generally, pigs have played a significant role in commercialised production and in most goats and fowl (usually chicken although possibly including ducks in

some cases) have been a significant source of household protein requirements. The war has probably been even more damaging to the livestock component of the sector familial economy than to the crop portion.

PDP District programmes should target livestock (and fowl) recovery goals in respect to household consumption and sale. Their relative importance/scale will vary, but is unlikely to be negligible in any District. While the broad input-extension-commercial network requirements for livestock are comparable to those for crops there are also significant differences. The initial **capital input** on the production side is **animals/fowl to re-establish viable core herds/flocks**. How to secure and distribute these does not appear to have attracted much attention to date either in Mozambique or in post-disaster (usually drought) livelihood rehabilitation programmes more generally. Further, depending on actual disease incidence and control techniques, a substantial number of dips and chemicals to operate them (e.g. for protection against East Coast Fever) are likely to need to be provided. Veterinary extension traditionally (probably appropriately) has a higher disease prevention and treatment component than does crop extension. Therefore, it may be desirable to envisage the Veterinary Service as the main distribution channel (charging some fee from year 2 or 3) until the interest of traders in carrying veterinary drugs and chemicals items can be assessed.

Labour-intensive public works have an equal importance in raising poor sector familial household incomes particularly for destitute (newly resettled or liberated) and female-headed households and during drought years. To serve the income augmentation purpose requires not merely labour intensity, but also seasonal phasing with peak employment potential at times other than those in which farm labour requirements are highest.

Ideally a target of an average of 6 weeks' work per household would be set. That would cost \$600 000 per district (2 400 person years) or \$24 million a year for all 40 Districts. That may be too optimistic a target on two counts:

- ability to mobilise resources;
- ability to deploy skilled and supervisory personnel, tools, complementary equipment and construction inputs (albeit by year 3 of the PDP that constraint could surely be broken).

If that is the case a fallback target of \$16 million overall would be plausible. The per household sum is very meagre indeed, but for many rural households it is above total present cash income. Such employment will be self-targeting. Households with reasonable cash incomes and economically profitable on farm (including land improvement and crop processing or artisanal production) labour opportunities will not seek work. However, priority should be given to returnado, former (resettling) *afectado* and *deslocado*, *amnestado* and newly liberated households who tend to be in the main destitute groups now and to **female-headed households** who historically, today and in the medium term have had/will have the lowest average cash incomes in the sector familial. Judging by Botswana's experience the last priority may require setting a minimum of 35% of all person months of employment aside for women. Social pressures are unlikely to be so uniform or strong as to deter women coming forward to seek work, but past habit and the "invisibility" of women to many functionaries can lead to their being 'overlooked' in hiring.

BACK TO NAMIBIA

The PDP relates only tangentially to two central aspects of Namibian agricultural strategy needs: large production units/employment and ecological protection.

In respect to large production units this relates to the PDP focus. The broader Mozambican record suggests that public sector corporate units are likely to be dead ends strategically and unviable as projects/enterprises outside specialised niches (e.g. the seed company, tea and perhaps sugar). This is relevant to reviewing FNDC (or successors) future priorities and present portfolio.

Mozambique's private commercial farm sector is now small and peripheral. Namibia's is substantial and strategic. Therefore, pushing it to the periphery of attention would be unwise. Three hypotheses from Mozambique's experience are worth testing in deciding Namibian policy.

First, if the large ranchers leave, it will be very difficult to keep the ranches operating effectively on their present technology and scale. Second, present ranch workers are unlikely to wish to become small-scale ranchers or mixed farmers. They are likely to wish to remain in wage employment. Unless wages, conditions of service and access to basic services are radically improved, they are likely to drift into peri-urban areas and/or relatives' urban households. Third, the least bad way to cut (output and state budget) losses on owner-abandoned medium- and large-scale units is to sell them to other experienced ranchers and the second least bad to turn them over to their present employees to reorganise either as co-ops or 'traditional' ranches.

The implications for Namibia include: maintaining the existing large ranching support services; seeking to enter the EEC, and other non-RSA markets; phasing down subsidies (including capital grants and concessional interest rates); creating an atmosphere conducive to present in-place ranchers staying and making ranch work more attractive to present employees.

The last might include: higher wages; better housing, water and food; allocation of plots for fowl, smallstock and, where feasible (e.g. by spot irrigation), some crop production (by the employee and his immediate household); where it has not already happened encouraging reunification of the employee's immediate household on the ranch; providing effective access to basic education and health services to ranch workers (requiring employer provision of transport when there is no common carrier alternative).

Ecological protection and rehabilitation is not a challenge which is comparable in Mozambique and Namibia beyond the common sense conclusions that overcrowding war-displaced persons on tiny chunks of land is environmentally destructive and that the woodfuel requirements of a major city in a low rainfall area have a disastrous impact on adjacent and medium-distance tree population.

IN CLOSING

The initial list of parallels, and the content of the PDP should speak for themselves to the informed Namibian reader. Doubtless they may say different things in different local contexts and reasonable people will to some extent hear them somewhat differently. But hearing, dialogue on what has been heard, and incorporating the voices into Namibian strategy are primarily for Namibians to do.

Perhaps that last point does justify drawing one conclusion. Especially at conceptualization and broad articulation level the **personnel involved should be basically Namibian**, and the selected uitlanders **chosen by Namibia** on the basis of their experience, known outlook and - preferably - prior knowledge of Namibia. Persons provided by agencies seeking to establish a policy-influencing role and especially ones able to use financial and

personnel carrots and sticks to "reinforce" their advice should be avoided. At later stages, technical specialists can be useful as, at all points, can selected persons working in the context of a Namibian-run institution and/or work team. That requires utilising all trained Namibians (made possible by reconciliation but also requiring rapid substantive involvement of the almost equal numbers who have returned from training abroad) and a coherent, articulated training strategy.