

**DRAFT FINAL**

**AGRICULTURAL SUBSIDY ISSUES**

**FOR**

**POLICY REVIEW/DISCUSSION**

**PREPARED FOR LENAUFU**

**BY**

**H.MAKHOOANE**

**March 25, 2011.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. ACRONYMS	2
2. BACKGROUND	3
3. SCOPE	3
4. TERMS OF REFERENCE	4
5. METHODOLOGY	4
6. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS POLICIES	4
7. MAIN FEATURES OF CURRENT POLICY AND ITS OBJECTIVES	5
8. MAIN POLICY OBJECTIVES	5
9. FINDINGS ON TOR's	6
10. OBSERVATIONS	9
11. CONCLUSIONS	11
12. RECOMMENDATIONS	11-12
13. APPENDICES:	
Participants Contributions & Recommendations	(i)
Yield Tables	(ii) (a) - (d)
References	(iii)

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

BOS	-	Bureau of Statistics
DAO	-	District Agricultural Officer
EC	-	European Commission
FAO	-	Food and Agricultural Organization
GOL	-	Government of Lesotho
IFAD	-	International Fund for Agricultural Development
MoAFS	-	Ministry of Agriculture and Food security
MoFLR	-	Ministry of Forestry and L and Reclamation
MoLGC	-	Ministry of Local Government and Chieftainship
LENAFU	-	Lesotho National Farmers Union
NEPAD	-	New Partnership for African Development
SACAU	-	Southern African Confederation of Agricultural Unions

## 1. BACKGROUND

Pursuant to its commitment to achieve poverty reduction and food security government of Lesotho (GOL) has over the years continued to use subsidized agricultural inputs in both crops and livestock sub –sectors. According to the Policy statement of **May 26<sup>th</sup> 2003**, these subsidies would also be used to help in building a sound foundation for sustainable agriculture that would eventually be predominantly commercial.

In the same policy statement **GOL** makes an undertaking to continue to assess its experience with subsidies to make adjustments in the ways subsidies are provided. It also undertakes to ensure that subsidies promote efficiency and sustainability in agriculture as well as give cost effective support to the government's program of poverty alleviation.

The history of fertilizer subsidy in many African countries dates back to 1970`s. Many countries imported and distributed fertilizer at subsidised prices. Around 1985 many countries dictated upon by **International Monetary Fund (IMF)** Structural Adjustment Program underwent a period of subsidies removal. Presently most African countries are reverting to fertilizer subsidies for various reasons. The recent increases in fuel prices has put pressure on African Governments to device means of assisting farmers to access this critical component of crop production. **NEPAD** is undertaking a study on fertilizer subsidy implementation in Africa with a goal of improving subsidy management.

Different approaches have been tried in the implementation of agricultural inputs subsidy program in Lesotho. These include using private sector as a vehicle for distribution of inputs to farmers, Government itself managing procurement and distribution. One other approach was the **Voucher System** under the supervision of **FAO**.

After many years of implementation of the subsidy program, it cannot be said with certainty whether this program is achieving the desired outcomes (**Food Security and Poverty Alleviation**),or whether indeed this is a sustainable program.

It is against this background that **LENAFU** has appointed a consultant to develop a document intended to provide the basis for facilitating a debate on issues surrounding **Agricultural Subsidy Program(s)** in Lesotho. This paper should identify the main policy features and main objectives of subsidy policy.

It should also make an analysis of key issues of policy in relation to its objectives and establish the extent to which it benefits farmers in **Lesotho**.

It should also address the issues of sustainability such that should subsidies be removed, farmers should continue to produce effectively and efficiently.

## 2. SCOPE

Ideally, this exercise should involve all or most stakeholders affected by the program. However, the time constraints and limited resources, only allows limited interaction with some of the identified stakeholders. The following is a list of major stakeholders identified:

- **Farmers**
- **Ministry of Agriculture and Food security**
- **Ministry of Forestry and land Reclamation**
- **Food and Agriculture Organization**
- **Private Sector (traders in farm inputs)**
- **NGOs**
- **National University of Lesotho (Faculty of Agriculture)**

## 3. TERMS OF REFERENCE (TORs)

The terms of reference as prescribed are follows:

- Need to identify the main features of the policy and its main objectives.
- To identify the primary suppliers of the agricultural inputs in Lesotho.
- To determine the conditions which guide the contractual arrangements between Government (Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security) and the main actor suppliers of inputs in Lesotho.
- Determine the extent to which farmers are involved in the identification and selection of contracted of suppliers; including farmers' contribution in determining what inputs would best suit their requirements.
- Establish how the level of subsidy is determined and arrived at.
- Find out what selection criterion is used to determine farmers who qualify for agricultural inputs in respect to the coupon system through the assistance of organizations such as **FAO** and **CARE-LESOTHO**.
- Determine what mechanisms are in place to ensure that the input subsidy filters down to the intended beneficiaries (farmers)
- Determine the role of private sector, including farmers in the implementation of the subsidy program.

- Establish the correlation between the size of the subsidy and the level of output as determined by the amount of land planted the number of farmers involved, yield output etc.
- Determine what role farmers organizations could play in distribution of subsidized inputs, and for the general administration and management of the subsidy program.
- What role would the private sector, other than farmers, play in the administration, distribution and management of these programs.
- Categorization of agricultural inputs that have qualified for subsidization.

#### **4. METHODOLOGY**

The Consultant reviewed available literature on previous and current policies in Agriculture; particularly as they relate to subsidies.

Some meetings were organised with individuals and groups of farmers. These meetings were held to get a feel of the different views of people who participated in the subsidy program. Other views were solicited from individuals who would have interest in matters of Food Security, simply from an academic view point, such as the National University of Lesotho NUL.

The views of participants are their own, and may be perceptions in some cases and may not even be accurate. Furthermore such views may not even agree with those of the Consultant.

#### **5. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS POLICIES**

The major policy objective in the 1970s was to intensify production in order to combat increasing land scarcity, which resulted from population pressure. In the 1980s, the relations between Lesotho and the Republic of South Africa deteriorated and resulted in a policy shift; whose major objective was to promote self-sufficiency in food production; thereby reducing dependence on South Africa, through importation of food commodities.

This effort however, did not achieve the desired level of food self-sufficiency. Instead it increased the burden on government's budget in subsequent years.

In the 1990s the agricultural policy shifted to re- emphasise services and provision of inputs through private contractors and also to limit government to extension services and development. These shifts in policy are not unique to Lesotho alone. Many African countries went through similar policy shifts in response to both internal and external factors.

## 6. Main Features of Current Policy and Main Objectives.

The following are issues for consideration for subsidy policy development:

- **Efficiency in Resource Utilization** -This can be achieved through using the most suitable crops and technologies. Subsidies when applied where suitable crops and technologies are employed, efficiency is achieved.
- **Long Term Investment** - Realization that investment in infrastructure or land conservation activities is sustainable makes subsidies for this purpose worthwhile.
- **Food Security** - Since the GOL has shifted from the Food self- sufficiency to emphasize need for food security, subsidies used to achieve this objective are justified.
- **Resource Allocation** – Since poverty alleviation and sound resource management are key elements of the overall government policy; wherever subsidies serve these objectives, they should be considered as proper use of government expenditure.

## 7. Main Policy Objectives.

- The main reason for subsidising inputs is to increase **Food Crop Production**; particularly maize being a staple crop. This is usually done through reducing the cost of production by subsidising inputs for crop production.
- The other objective is to encourage adoption of new technologies. Subsidies would be applied on mixing old, tested technologies with new innovative ones. These shifts in farming systems have proved to be risky for farmers and should be subsidised if they are deemed to be beneficial.

Some examples of these new technologies are the introduction of **Irrigation Systems**. The subsidies become even more relevant where credit facilities for farmers are not available, such as in the Lesotho situation.

- Encouraging **Investment in Conservation** practices is yet another objective. Here again like in adoption of new technologies, there is an element of risk involved. Farmers will only improve and conserve land only if they have full control of their land. The issue of Land Reform has to be seriously considered; if land protection is to be achieved. Moreover, subsidies aimed at land improvements have to be applied. This

issue requires combined efforts with the Ministry of Local Government and Chieftainship (MoLGC) to develop legislation which encourages land protection by farmers

## 8. FINDINGS ON TOR's

### a. Primary Suppliers of Agricultural Inputs in Lesotho.

Below are the primary suppliers of agricultural inputs in Lesotho:

- ❖ Insecticides - **Bayor**
- ❖ Seed - **Pannar, Sensako, Pioneer, Monsanto**
- ❖ Fertilizer - **Sasol, Ommnia,**
- ❖ Livestock medication - **pfyser, intervvet**
- ❖ Herbicides - **Ifecto, Bayor**

These are the major seed and fertilizer producers, as well as pesticides and Livestock Medication. There are many agents with different names which are just agents.

**NB:** It should be noted that all these inputs are imported. (Mostly from the Republic of South Africa)

### b. Conditions that Guide Contractual Arrangements for Input Procurement.

Conditions vary depending on conditions or circumstances in a given period. There are times when inputs will have been procured and stock-piled at government depots. Traders will buy from government depots and in turn sell to farmers and claim from government. In other cases contracted traders will sell to farmers from their own stocks, sell to the farmers and claim from **MoAFS**.

### c. The Extent to which Farmers are Involved

This is one area where there is a weakness in implementation. Most of the people that participated in meetings which were held raised concerns about this issue. While it may be argued that the personnel in the Ministry are fairly knowledgeable about inputs, it is important that farmers and other stakeholders are involved in selection of inputs; for purposes of information sharing and capacity building. Piles of inputs are still held at **Ha Foso** from previous season/s because either the farmers were not interested in the given types of inputs, or they were not familiar with them.



#### **d. Determination of Levels of Subsidy.**

During the 1970's and the 1980's, some efforts were made to measure all arable land; using Land Survey methods to establish some basis on which area to determine required inputs. Currently it seems the level of subsidy is driven by available and predetermined budgetary provisions.

#### **e. Selection Criteria for Farmers who Qualify for Inputs**

There are no defined criteria. Government will announce subsidy and anyone can buy inputs. This goes for MoAFS directly run programs. The exception is the FAO programme implemented recently where farmers were targeted. This system addressed the usual problem where Government officials handle money. Since dealers take inputs to the farmers, everyone is able to benefit from these subsidies. The system also promotes markets, and farmers are able to choose inputs of their choice.

#### **f. Mechanisms in place to ensure Subsidies Filter to Intended Beneficiaries.**

Various approaches have been devised in an effort to ensure that subsidies reach the intended beneficiaries. These include incidences where **MoAFS** is hands-on in the management of subsidy programs. Besides this, traders were allowed to sell inputs and submit claims to **MoAFS** for reimbursement.

For different reasons it seems subsidies are still not accessible, at least to some farmers. Transport to remote areas is a serious problem. Centralized procurement continues to make it difficult for less advantaged farmers to access inputs.

Presently, **MoAFS** is planning to work with traders since the traders are able to reach many community areas; particularly remote and outlying ones.

#### **g. The Role of the Private Sector.**

The private sector in Lesotho has been involved in various ways to participate in the program. This has been done through the use of privately owned tractors, engaging traders in the business of selling these inputs to farmers; and in turn claiming reimbursement from **MoAFS**. Some traders seem to suggest that there is still too much government involvement in the implementation of this program. As such they feel

government should only play a planning and monitoring role; and leave the rest to the private sector.

#### **h. Correlation between Size of Subsidy and Output Level.**

Upon adopting the intensive agricultural strategy in the early 1980's, government hoped that Lesotho would be self-sufficient in food grains by mid- 1980's. Trends at that time have shown that in fact Lesotho food grain imports showed a progressive increase. Self sufficiency in maize dropped from 50% in 1980 to 26% in 1991/92. Similar drop in wheat production was experienced.(**Agriculture Situation Report-1994**). Other studies around this time have suggested that very few households in Lesotho have capacity to produce enough grain to sustain them all year round. There is no evidence to suggest that the size of subsidy and output level has been shown, even in the years of good harvest.

#### **i. Potential for Farmers Organizations Role in Subsidy Management.**

There is immense potential for Farmer Organizations to play a role in Subsidy Programs. However experience has taught us that there are some fundamental issues to address. First of all we need to appreciate that the farmer groups come from a diverse social and cultural background. The different levels of sophistication that they are at, in managing businesses necessarily calls for a conscious Capacity Building Program to be embarked upon.

It is very important to identify who the farmers are to facilitate targeting.

Previous experience with village distribution points (though not quite meant for subsidy) in projects like **Khomo- Khoana** and **Thaba-Bosiu**, shows that farmers can be entrusted to effectively handle at least part of the subsidy program.

Some basic infrastructure will have to be put in place, and as indicated above, an integrated capacity building program will have to be undertaken in order to ensure that farmers are adequately "equipped" to manage the program.

The Ministry of Agriculture (**MoAFS**) should undertake to pilot this approach and remove the administration burden from the officials; and instead have them concentrate on monitoring and provision of Extension Services.

Working with farmers from planning to implementation of any programme where farmers are involved is critical for such programmes.

#### j. Potential Role of the Private Sector in the future

Private Sector has played an important role in the distribution of subsidies in the past. There have been problems of transparency and quality control. Traders tend to see subsidies as just another avenue where they can maximize profit without realization that subsidies have a specific purpose. There is need for capacity building for private sector by Government. With proper training and systems established traders can play an important role in subsidy programmes since they are close to farmers. It is critical that traders receive training before participating in the subsidy programme.

#### 9. OBSERVATIONS

- There seems to have been no deliberate effort to compare yields with subsidies to those without subsidies.
- Of the farmers interviewed, most have raised a concern that Government does not consult farmers when planning the subsidy programme.
- From brief interactions with farmers, it has become clear that farmers are not familiar with policies in **MoAFS**.
- It is not clear to the consultant if it is clear who the farmer is.
- Most policy documents are written in the English language only.
- It is not clear whether consultations are held frequently enough, and in adequate detail with stakeholders whenever there is need for policy adjustments.
- Continuity in the implementation of programs gets disrupted by what may be priorities. (as determined by some external factors) The following example is a case at hand to make a point of this observation:

The May 2003 policy document on subsidies in the agricultural sector clearly articulates policies intended to achieve both **Economic and Social** objectives.

These objectives include the following:

- Expansion in output of targeted crops, this addresses encouraging production of important staple food crops by lowering the cost of production of targeted crops by making inputs available to farmers at lower than commercial prices.

- Poverty reduction and household food security promotion increased production translates to increase of access to food by reducing the quality food that poor people have to buy cost of inputs for growing foods is too high for poor farmers).
- Encourage efficient use of all resources in the country. The point here is that if farmers cannot afford to pay for inputs or other costs of using land, then they may not use land at all or they may use it inefficiently.
- Other reasons for providing subsidies were examined. These address such external incidences like times when **Prices** are **Low** in the markets; thereby warranting stabilization funds that provide price support. This was specifically in the livestock subsector.

The above mentioned, and indeed other policy areas shown in this document, continue to be relevant for Lesotho situation.

An Implementation Framework was developed which makes use of **Subsidies and Credit** support for a five-year **Food Security** program, covering the period **2003/04 to 2008/09**.

This Program contained **Four Elements**; namely:

- **Planning and Implementation.**
- **Program of Intensive Diversified Production.**
- **Program of Rain-fed Grain Production.**
- **Program of Livestock Production.**

The program took cognizance of the **Four Ecological Zones** of Lesotho. As it turns out, this program has either been put on hold or cancelled in favor of other priorities. It is the Consultant's view that this program continues to be relevant

The 2010 **Millennium Development Goals** Report (**MDGs**) highlights factors which contribute to Lesotho's low agricultural output; which in turn will impact on achievement of other **MDGs**.

The program contained in the framework mentioned above goes a long way in addressing this low agricultural output. It is the consultant's considered view that this program should be reviewed and revived as a matter of necessity.

## 10. CONCLUSIONS.

- ❖ The general view of the farmers that were interviewed is that subsidies are a useful tool for increasing food production; and as such should be made available to everyone.  
It is the Consultant's view that blanket subsidies should not be applied. The history of subsidies in Lesotho has proved that they are ineffective. The criteria for application of targeted subsidies have been proposed and should be applied.
- ❖ It is critical to involve farmers from planning to implementation of Fubusidy programmes. An assumption that offi.. know what farmers will always render a subsidy programme, and indeed other well throughout programmes ineffective.
- ❖ In the implementation of targeted subsidies, private sector (traders) and or farmer organizations should be used as a vehicle for distribution of inputs. Capacity building for these groups is essential for their proper functioning.
- ❖ While it is generally agreed that providing subsidies to resource poor farmers in order to help them address household food security, a deliberate effort to have a bias in favor of commercial production should be undertaken.
- ❖ Review of land capability guides which were developed in the 1970s to support subsidy-targeting, is needed.
- ❖ It is only when incentives such as inputs subsidization are targeted towards commercialization, that food security can be attained.

## 11. RECOMMENDATIONS

- In planning any subsidies in the future, farmers should be involved from planning to implementation of such a programme to ensure success.
- Participation of all stakeholders in policy formulation is critical and should be done.

- Agreed policies should be written in the two official languages; namely Sesotho and English.
- It is essential that implementation of projects enjoys protection from undue influence. A good program may not yield the desired results if it is interrupted before the period it was designed for.
- The old extension tool of demonstrations should not be underestimated; instead it should be encouraged and supported. There is need to demonstrate that food production can actually be enhanced by producing food crops where they are best suited. Subsidies can, therefore, be used to achieve increased production.
- A more detail study to compare yields with and without subsidy should be undertaken.

**PARTICIPANTS CONTRIBUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The table below shows individuals, farmer groups and dates interviews were held.

<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>			<u>DATES</u>
Mokhotlong	DAO	-	26 <sup>th</sup> January 2011
FAO	Res – Rep	-	4 <sup>th</sup> February 2011
Dept Head (a.i)	Crops Dept.	-	14 <sup>th</sup> February 2011
Wool and Mohair	(COE)	-	18 <sup>th</sup> February 2011
Agronomy Dept. NUL	Prof. Mohamed	-	24 <sup>th</sup> February 2011
Leribe	DAO	-	25 <sup>TH</sup> February 2011
Maseru block farmers	Association	-	1 <sup>st</sup> March, 2011
Mejametalane	MADAUA	-	2 <sup>ND</sup> March, 2011

There were a total of eight (8) participants in all; and this is what they had to say:

**Mokhotlong DAO (a.i) Head of Crops Dept. (substantive)**

Farmers feel subsidy goes a long way in supporting crop production.

Planning should be done on time.

Farmers should be involved in selection of inputs, particularly seed.  
FAO voucher system allows wide choice of inputs.

**FAO RES. REP.**

FAO is keen to participate in the exercise.

Funding is limited at this point

Contribution on providing documents and other information will be provided.

Proposal to look into success stories in the region, one example is made of the Malawi experience on maize production.

**DEPT. HEAD (a.i) CROPS DEPT. MR. MOTSETSERO**

- Believes there's potential to produce 80% of country cereal needs. Currently we produce less than 30%.
- Blanket subsidy effects not been visible over years.
- Presently using targeted subsidies.
- Subsidized inputs come late (Nov-Dec).
- In 2009 to 2010 inputs were procured in June to July. Yields were higher compared to most years.

**WOOL AND MOHAIR ASSOCIATION – MR. LEHLOBA (CEO)**

- In small stock the objective of subsidy has been achieved. Wool and mohair farmers continue to produce globally accepted product
- Presently the support which Government used to provide has diminished. Breeding studs are not functional. Staff at wool sheds has not been replaced farmers themselves have replaced between 60 – 65 staff members at wool sheds.
- Farmers wish to have studs and shearing sheds handed over to them. Government seems reluctant to hand over the facilities.

Stabilization fund was established to deal with price fluctuations in the markets. The fund has since been discounted.

- Purchase of breeding stock has stopped because of mismanagement of the revolving fund.
- All 50 Livestock Improvement Centers closed down also because of mismanagement.
- The only remaining subsidy is Extension Service.
- Farmers still wish to receive more subsidy

**INPUTS TRADER – MRS. LETSAPO (MED SUPPLIERS)**

- Subsidies are useful if proper planning is done.
- Government machinery works too slow.
- Leadership in **MOAFS** is lacking.
- Donor funding should not all go through government.
- Private sector should tender directly to donors where funding comes from donors.
- Suppliers are not involved in selection of inputs



- There is very poor monitoring on the part of **MOAFS**, because of this weakness traders engage in corrupt practices.
- Subsidies are not good for our business if payments are delayed by Government bureaucracy.
- If government continues to be hands – on businesses are bound to suffer.

#### AGRONOMY DEPARTMENT –PROF. MOHAMED (NUL)

- Unplanned subsidy implemented, not targeted not focused.
- Lesotho is primarily a livestock country.
- High value crops to be targeted and subsidized. Seed production in sorghum cited an example.
- We need to stop tilling land and exposing it to erosion.
- There is a serious contradiction where farm holdings qualify to be that of peasant farmers yet sophisticated equipment such as tractors and combine harvesters suggest commercial agriculture. With such high input costs and extremely low crop yields there's need to revise policy.
- Government is imposing subsidy.
- Support should go to what famers do best.
- Subsidy should be re-directed to **Range Improvement** and **Livestock Production**. There is big land base most farmers are good in this sub-sector (success in wool & mohair). Few farmers need to be supported to engage in commercial farming.

#### LERIBE FARMERS AT DAOs OFFICES (PARTICIPANTS LIST ATTACHED)

##### M.MOLAPO

- Land is used by people who do not own it.
- Very few people qualify to be farmers.
- Government provides subsidies in response to plea by international community that governments should ensure that people have access to food.
- All inputs are procured from R.S.A. agents not from factories, hence production costs are high.
- Subsidy is necessary
- Farmers to be subsidized should be indentified and subsidy to be directed to them.

**M. KOMANE – TRADER**

- Traders provide a service.
- All concerned should benefit from subsidy (not farmers alone).
- Government should plan, but not implement.
- Private sector should distribute.
- Present subsidy does not benefit the poor.
- Traders work for profit.

**MAKHARILELE**

- Government has responsibility for food for all, therefore it should continue to provide subsidy.
- Subsidy should reach all.
- People in high positions should not enrich themselves from subsidies (tractors we all taken by politicians).

**'NENA**

- Targeted subsidy desirable but creates problems because politicians interfere at implementation to protect votes.
- Choice of inputs imposed by government.
- Infrastructure for irrigation to be established and subsidy directed to the irrigated areas.

**T. MOLAPO**

- Agricultural policy lacking.
- Government is shy to shift budget to support to agriculture.
- Need for bold Leadership.
- Authorities interfere with programs.

**MONTS'I**

- Subsidy is necessary.
- There must be monitoring.

MASERU DISTRICT BLOCK FARMERS ASSOCIATION (PARTICIPANTS LIST ATTACHED)

FOULO

- Subsidy is very important for increased crop production
- The way subsidy is presently implemented benefits very few.
- Very few Government officials make major decisions for many farmers on subsidies.
- Why are we using private sector depots when government has depots.
- Subsidy is good but planning is poor. All stakeholders should plan together.
- Things happen at private sector depots that affect the program adversely.

MATSINYANE

- Subsidies can be a key to unlock development.
- Infrastructure should be developed.
- R.S.A provided infrastructure for farmers.
- Subsidies do not go to other subsectors (livestock).
- Many countries have banks which handle subsidies.
- Agricultural banks support long-term development.

MAKOANYANE

- Credit facility is an important component.
- Monitoring of subsidy program is critical.

TAOANA

- Farmers are left out at planning stage, hence planning shoots in the dark since they do not know farmer needs. Inputs are rolling at **Ha Foso**
- Subsidies should not be for everybody. Currently subsidies are given to people who cannot even use them.
- Charges for Government machinery are set without farmers' involvement.
- Processing of payments to tractor owners takes too long.

- FAO coupon system - MOAFS selects which farmers participate, transparency is highly questionable.
- Farmers queue up to pay at HEAD QUARTERS, and travel to **Ha Foso**. This has proved very cumbersome and costly.

#### 'MAMOLIEHI

- Politicians interfere in subsidy program. Subsidized tractors and irrigation equipment allocated to people in positions of influence.

#### MADAUA MEETING AT MEJAMETALANA (PARTICIPANTS LIST ATTACHED)

##### S. MAKOANYANE

- Subsidies are good for increased production.
- Farmers spend too much time running around to access inputs. Village distribution points should be introduced.
- Market structure should be established for produce.

#### 'MAKHIBA

- Subsidy is necessary but should be managed by farmers.
- Training for farmers on subsidy should be made.
- Subsidy should cover all aspects of agricultural production.
- Subsidies should be run through a bank.
- Animal protection against theft to be subsidized.

#### MOKETE

- Full information on subsidies should be provided.
- Selection criteria must be transparent.
- Subsidy ends up taken by administrative costs.
- "Crop Theft" unit similar to stock theft unit to be established

**CHELE**

- Animal protection against theft to be strengthened.
- Subsidy should be targeted.

**M. KABI**

- Transport costs to be subsidized.
- Animal feeds to be subsidized.

MAIZE YIELD IN THE SIX DISTRICTS  
INVOLVED IN FSSP (1)

Appendix (ii) (a)

DISTRICTS

Season	Botha-Bothe	Leribe	Berea	Maseru	Mafeteng	Mohale's Hoek	Quthing	Average (kg/ha)
73/74	1183	869	782	886	781	1160	785	921
74/75	855	561	531	552	543	548	342	562
75/76	768	599	367	405	295	320	360	445
76/77	2154	1569	1577	1390	1171	1068	966	1414
77/78	1800	1399	1275	1079	1049	1706	756	1295
78/79	2045	962	1172	1030	514	844	1269	1119
79/80	1153	780	982	1073	570	862	907	904
80/81	1115	899	804	690	459	847	535	764
81/82	1034	961	716	584	200	539	574	658
82/83	1013	1002	937	765	334	130	174	622
83/84	625	731	520	678	393	212	395	508
84/85	576	831	932	715	385	344	313	585
85/86	763	797	739	769	340	434	407	607
86/87	681	811	655	631	283	479	384	561
87/88	1047	1092	875	1081	453	609	834	856
88/89	638	1064	1022	736	484	419	652	716
89/90	1405	1185	1319	1155	871	847	1128	1130
90/91	310	513	717	604	268	578	550	506

Source: Lesotho Situation Report/1994

**PRODUCTION OF MAIN CROPS IN LESOTHO**  
1977/78-1991/92 (Metric Tons)

YEAR	MAIZE	SORGHUM	WHEAT	BEANS	PEAS
1977/78	143,168	85,775	57,906	10,783	4,427
1978/79	124,856	68,952	33,629	8,350	6,856
1979/80	105,619	59,286	28,194	3,585	4,562
1980/81	105,674	47,729	16,993	3,517	3,198
1981/82	83,028	26,158	14,462	4,898	4,525
1982/83	76,180	30,687	14,810	1,624	3,367
1983/84	79,384	33,768	17,127	1,338	3,639
1984/85	92,350	54,823	18,434	2,478	3,277
1985/86	86,488	33,440	11,009	2,779	1,502
1986/87	94,912	31,232	18,520	3,344	1,467
1987/88	159,726	53,135	19,237	7,383	2,564
1988/89	137,227	31,140	29,653	9,706	1,473
1989/90	171,579	36,062	33,162	13,071	1,950
1990/91	48,918	10,043	7,026	2,465	745
1991/92	61,074	19,468	11,854	1,303	1,375

Source: Bureau of Statistics and Ministry of Agriculture, Lesotho Agricultural situation Report, 1988 edition

**MAIZE**

	<b>AREA PLANTED</b>	<b>AREA HARVESTED</b>	<b>PRODUCTION</b>	<b>YIELD IN TONS</b>
1996/1997	161,814	144,116	142,050	0.99
1997/1998	98,105	82,829	11,679	1.43
1998/1999	140,800	132,356	124,549	0.94
1999/2000	170,101	157,945	277,685	1.76
2000/2001	195,037	177,503	158,189	0.89
2001/2002	145,762	138,256	111,205	0.80
2002/2003	137,585	127,469	85,032	0.67
2003/2004	129,436	127,629	80,998	0.63
2004/2005	120,011	112,302	100,723	0.90
2005/2006	132,542	123,508	76,908	0.62
2006/2007	149,242	123,661	60,312	0.49
2007/2008	146,862	137,156	59,651	0.43
2009/2010	122,822		98,035	

Source: MoAFS

For 2009/2010 we only have Crop forecasting results.



**SORGHUM**

	<b>AREA PLANTED</b>	<b>AREA HARVESTED</b>	<b>PRODUCTION</b>	<b>YIELD TONS</b>	<b>IN</b>
1996/1997	39,580	39,580	29,050	0.73	
1997/1998	19,405	15,453	22,815	1.48	
1998/1999	31,652	30,067	33,340	1.11	
1999/2000	27,802	25,831	26,807	1.04	
2000/2001	55,082	52,498	45,354	0.86	
2001/2002	30,035	28,209	11,919	0.42	
2002/2003	26,442	25,203	11,953	0.47	
2003/2004	29,378	29,192	11,482	0.39	
2004/2005	30,643	29,687	18,527	0.62	
2005/2006	29,037	28,101	12,188	0.43	
2006/2007	37,352	32,175	7,837	0.24	
2007/2008	19,090	17,585	10,151	0.58	
2009/2010	30,504	17,585	28,082		

Source: MoAFS

For 2009/2010 we only have Crop forecasting results.

- **References:**

- 1 – National Forum on Agriculture and Food Security by MoAFS ..... June, 2010
- 2 – Summary of the Lesotho Food Security Policy by MoAFS .....  
Oct. 2008
- 3 – National Action Plan for Food Security by MoAFS ..... Oct.  
2006
- 4 – Subsidies in the Agricultural Sector Policy Statement by MoAFS .....  
May 2003
- 5 – Lesotho Situation Report by BOS..... 1994
- 6 – Agricultural Mechanisation Strategy Formulation – UNDP/Les/88/009 ...1994  
D.Bordet & M. Mhlanga