



**STUDY VALIDATION MEETING ON AGROECOLOGICAL PRODUCE CROSS-BORDER
TRADE IN THE EAC**

29TH -30TH APRIL 2025 | MAANZONI LODGE, NAIROBI, KENYA

Executive Summary

This report summarizes the key outcomes of the validation meeting on agroecological produce cross-border trade in the EAC, organized by AFSA. Held on 29–30 April 2025, the meeting brought together 59 stakeholders from Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda, and the DRC. The study investigated current trade patterns, policy landscapes, constraints, and opportunities related to agroecological trade. Key outcomes included a call for policy harmonization, increased stakeholder capacity, the establishment of agroecology trade corridors, and replication of the study in Burundi and South Sudan. Action points targeted CSOs, governments, regional bodies, and traders.

List of Acronyms

EAC	East African community
AFSA	Alliance for Food Sovereignty in Africa
SSFs	Small scale farmers
PGS	Participatory Guarantee System
EALA	East African Legislative Assembly
NTBs	Non-Tariff Barriers
ACFTA	African Continental Free Trade Area
AAE	African Agroecological Entrepreneurship
CAADP	Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
NOGAMU	National Organic Agriculture Movement of Uganda
UNBS	Uganda National Bureau of Standards
STR	Simplified trade regime
RECs	Regional Economic Communities

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	4
1.0 Background	5
2.0 Introduction	7
2.1 Participation and Expectations	8
2.2 Participants’ insights about the study and expectations	8
3.0 Main Activity Highlights.....	9
3.1 Introduction to the ‘Strengthening Cross-Border Trade in the East African Region for Agroecological Produce’ Project.....	9
3.2 Opening Remarks	9
3.3 Opening Remarks from Mr. Ayele Kebede - Regional Development Cooperation Africa, Environment, Climate and Sustainable Natural Resources Management, SIDA.	10
3.4 Opening Remarks by Hon. Françoise Uwumukiza, Chairperson of the Committee on Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources of the East African Legislative Assembly (EALA)	10
4.0 Presentation on an overview and appreciation of Agroecology and Related Concepts	11
4.1 Plenary Discussions.....	12
5.0 Presentation of Study Findings on Agroecological Produce Cross-Border Trade	13
5.5 Section on agroecology cross-border trade	15
5.9 Session Three: Conclusions and Recommendations.....	16
5.10 Resolutions from this section	17
6.0 First Panel Day.....	17
7.0 Group Work	20
7.1 Regional Economic Communities (RECs)	20
7.2 Government Group	21
7.3 Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)	22
7.4 Traders	23

1.0 Background

The study validation meeting on agroecological produce cross-border trade in the EAC, held 29th -30th April 2025 in Maanzoni Lodge, Nairobi, Kenya brought together various value web actors to discuss the study findings, network and chart a way forward on how best to improve EAC cross border trade for Agroecological produce. Organised by AFSA, the meeting brought together 59 participants (25 Female and 34 Male) including, traders, farmers, researchers, policy makers, agroecological entrepreneurs from Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda and the DRC. The report provided insights into the ecosystem for cross-border trade in agroecological produce taking within the East African Community, through findings from select territorial markets at the border points. These border points include Busia (Kenya -Uganda), Mpondwe (Democratic Republic of Congo - Uganda), Namanga- Tarakea (Kenya -Tanzania) and Rusumo (Rwanda -Tanzania).

The findings revealed that diverse agroecological products traded within the EAC across the territorial markets in the select borders. Some of these products include maize, beans, groundnuts, sorghum, cassava, bananas, aerial yams (*dioscorea bulbifera*), sweet potatoes, fish, forest products (honey, medicinal plants and herbs), rice, cabbages, carrots, onions, tomatoes, avocados, cocoyam, and millet among others. The findings showed a high potential of intra-EAC trade to thrive on agroecological products more than conventional one. Study findings also revealed that there are existing support programs like the EAC and COMESA Simplified Trade Regime (STR), and the AfCFTA Women and Youth in Trade Protocol which if effectively implemented could facilitate the participation of small-scale agroecological traders in cross-border trade. It was also found that there is an increasing enacting of agroecology policies by EAC Partner States, with Kenya and Tanzania launching their respective policies, while Uganda was in the latest stage of finalising its policy.

However, the study findings revealed major constraints to agroecological entrepreneurs in cross border -EAC trade to include limited knowledge of cross-border trade regulations, lack of visibility within formal trade systems, prevalence of Non-Tariff Barriers (NTBs) to trade, limited understanding of agroecology and agroecological products by value web actors e.g., border customs and standards compliance officials, poor trade facilitating infrastructure (e.g., lack of sufficient common user facilities in territorial markets), Taxes (e.g., withholding tax), and lack of implementation of the Simplified Trade Regime (STR) whose goal is to simplify the documentation and procedures for the clearance of lowvalue consignments of small cross-border traders.

As a way of charting a way forward, participants made key resolutions on how make the study reach its intended recipients, as well as how AE cross border can be improved on. These resolutions include:

-  **Replicate study in other EAC Partner States:** AFSA and partners need to ensure to get resources so this study can be replicated in Burundi and South Sudan, leaving them out poses many dangers such as infiltration of EAC markets with conventional produce and inputs as well as contradicting the principle of leaving no one behind.
-  **Streamline documentation on trade in AE produce:** All cross-border customs authorities should seek to improve documentation of agroecological trade across the borders to get credible results in the future concerning the same.
-  **Leverage partnerships to build an agroecology movement:** AFSA Members and partners need to participate in the dissemination of AFSA's case studies till the grassroots level. This

will prove to the SSFs, duty bearers, that AE works and can go a long way to improving the community's income and livelihoods, countries can use it as a comparative advantage in trade as remain competitive.

- ✚ **Mindset change:** All EA advocates to work on changing the narrative favoring conventional agriculture through researching and disseminating research results on the impact of industrial foods on human health, using media to disseminate economic, health benefits of AE that will increase adoption but also acceptance in the legislation and other government circles.
- ✚ **Awareness creation for value web actors on Agroecology:** AE advocates to embark on creating awareness on AE among certifying bodies to boost their understanding of the subject AE, acquire appropriate technology at all border posts capable of identifying Agroecological produce from non-Agroecological produce. Only then will it be included in the certifying protocols provisions specifically for AE products.
- ✚ **Advocate for a policy ecosystem that is supportive of AEP trade:** All EA actors need to amplify Advocacy around ensuring that EAC countries establish clear strategies on how to ensure promotion of trade in safe, healthy foods that uphold principles of sovereignty instead of promoting production at whatever costs.
- ✚ **Harmonization of trade policies at EAC level:** All regional legislators should seek to ensure harmonized trade policies in all EAC countries, fair enforcement and minimization of non-tariff barriers.
- ✚ **Establish a regional technical working group on the promotion of cross-border AE trade** that includes a cross section of actors capable and willing to support AE traders.
- ✚ **Launch and support pilot cross-border AE trade corridors:** These will ensure safeguarding the quality of AE produce as well as used a basis for advocating for a premium for AE produce since they will not be mixed among other produce.
- ✚ **Conducting stakeholder mapping of all EAC agroecology actors** and documenting them with a view of establishing an actor's platform for the EAC region and developing an EAC reporting and feedback mechanism to monitor what each actor is doing in the promotion of cross-border trade
- ✚ **Lobby EALA for an EAC Agroecology strategy/policy** to provide a regional policy framework that guides EAC Cross border trade in AEPs.
- ✚ **Capacitation of agroecology actors/institutions** and seek to customize the available organic certification standard to include AE, revising the existing policies to address concerns for SSFs practicing AE, and carrying out budget advocacy to ensure deliberate allocation for AE promotion.
- ✚ **Leverage on participatory guaranteed system (PGS)** to facilitate access to certification for cross-border trade and compliance. More PGS to be created and supported to operate, linked to each other in different EAC countries to cheaply guarantee quality of AE produce in the region.

- ✚ Training traders and farmers about the 13 principles of AE in all the EAC countries so they can produce, trade while preserving the AE principles.

2.0 Introduction

There is a growing appreciation of agroecology by most countries in the EAC. This is exhibited in strategies and efforts taken at individual state level such as; the launch of the National Ecological Organic Agriculture Strategy (NEOAS) for 2023–2030 by Tanzania, Kenya’s National Agroecology for Food System Transformation Strategy for 2024–2033, which was launched in 2024, and Uganda’s National Agroecology Strategy 2023/24–2028/29 which is in its final stages of drafting. While the DRC does not have a dedicated agroecology policy or strategy, the Sustainable Agricultural Policy of 2022-2032, the country's primary agricultural framework, recognizes the role of agroecology by collaborating with various grassroots initiatives and organizations within the DRC. Furthermore, in 2024, the Committee on Agriculture, Tourism, and Natural Resources (ATNR) of the East African Legislative Assembly (EALA) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) signed a resolution officially recognizing agroecology as a strategic priority for formulating and recommending sustainable policies in agriculture and natural resource management across the EAC¹. Amidst such a policy shift, an increasing population that feeds from the market, it is essential to assess and document the implications for trade in agroecological products.

Despite the market access potential presented by the EAC, several measures limit intra-EAC trade in agroecological produce. For example, the slow implementation of the Time-Bound Programme for the Elimination of Identified and Reported Non-Tariff Barriers (NTBs) to improve trade in the region has led to continued outstanding NTBs (reported at 11 as of February 2024²). Poor trade-facilitating infrastructure (e.g., lack of sufficient common user facilities on border crossing markets), Taxes (withholding tax), and the prevalence of conventional trading (trading in industrial-scale produced food and seed produced in and outside the region) are edging out agroecological traders from the market. For example, there was a significant surge in processed food imports in 2022, estimated at \$7.4 billion, and expected to grow by 30 percent in 2025³, a trend, if left unchecked, will undermine trading in Agroecological products in the EAC.

With this background, Alliance for Food Sovereignty in Africa (AFSA) commissioned a study to better understand the state of trade in agroecological products within the East African Community (EAC). Under Articles 4 and 5 of the EAC Common Market Protocol, Partner States commit to promote free movement of goods, persons, labour, and services through eliminating tariff, non-tariff, and technical barriers to trade, harmonizing and mutually recognizing standards, and easing cross-border movement of persons⁴ among others. It is also hoped that the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) will consolidate both intra-regional trade and trade with the rest of Africa. While one can question the extent, it cannot be dismissed that if well-crafted and implemented from a food sovereignty standpoint, these trade regimes can promote the participation of marginalized actors like smallholder farmers, fish folks who primarily practice agroecology.

The prime purpose conducted at 4 the border points of: Busia (Kenya and Uganda), Mpondwe (Democratic Republic of Congo and Uganda), Namanga- Tarakea (Kenya and Tanzania) and Rusumo (Rwanda and Tanzania) was to deepen all agriculture, agroecology, trade, policy actors’

¹ EALA. (2024). EALA Signs a resolution with FAO, Recognizing Agro-ecology as a Strategic Priority in the EAC; <https://www.eala.org/media/view/east-african-legislative-assembly-signs-a-resolution-with-food-agriculture-organization-fao-recognizing-agro-ecology-as-a-strategic-priority-in-the-eac#:~:text=Kampala%2C%20Uganda%20%E2%80%93%20November%2018%2C,signed%20a%20resolution%20officially%20recognizing>

² EAC. (2024). Report of Senior Officials Meeting of Sectoral Council on Trade, Industry, Finance and Investment (SCTIFI); Ref: EAC / SCTIFI / 43 / 2024

³ TijaraHub. (2024). The Rise of Processed Foods in East Africa: Market Analysis & Future Outlook; <https://tijarahub.com/tijarahub-blogs/the-rise-of-processed-foods-in-east-africa-market-analysis-and-future-outlook/>

⁴ EAC. (2012). Protocol on the Establishment of the EAC Common Market; <https://eacj.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Common-Market-Protocol.pdf>

knowledge about cross-border trade in agroecological products within the East African Community (EAC). It is hoped that this data will support the development and implementation of harmonized trade policies and practices, thereby facilitating the growth and sustainability of agroecological trade in the region.

Specifically, the study sought to:

- (a) Identify and document the key types, volumes, and pathways of agroecological produce being traded across borders within the EAC.
- (b) Perform a comparative analysis of agroecological and non-agroecological products traded along the borders
- (c) Analyse existing trade policies, regulations, practices, and infrastructures affecting agroecological produce in the EAC member states.
- (d) In-depth analysis of the value chain and market system, Tariffs and Non-Tariff Barriers/opportunities, and the role of AFCFTA and other trade agreements in promoting cross-border trade for agroecological produce
- (e) Investigate the socio-economic impact of agroecological produce trade on different demographic groups, including smallholder farmers, women, and youth.

Against this background, AFSA organised a validation meeting to share key findings from the study to inform and catalyze actions that enhance and expand cross-border trade in agroecological produce within the EAC. Specifically, the meeting aimed to: (a) Validate the research findings and recommendations to ensure they reflect on-ground realities; (b) Identify opportunities for agroecological products/produce in the region; (c) Identify solutions to existing barriers, including non-tariff barriers (NTBs) and policy constraints, (d) Discuss harmonization of trade policies and standards to facilitate agroecological produce trade in the EAC; and (e)

Foster collaboration among stakeholders, including policymakers, CSOs, traders, AAEs TMs and to support Trade in agroecological produce

2.1 Participation and Expectations

The meeting was attended by 59 participants, with 25 Female and 34 Male, from a wide range of fields to include academia, traders, legislators, CSOs, public service, etc.

2.2 Participants' insights about the study and expectations

To set the mood of the meeting, participants were asked to share their preliminary understanding of the study as well as expectations. The following key issues were raised:



Dr. David Kabanda of CEFROnt making a point in the meeting

✚ There is a growing value addition in agroecological products by actors like women in territorial markets like Busia and Rusumo.

✚ Even with growing availability in territorial market, agroecological products still face challenges with accessing cross-border markets due to barriers associated with certification, poor trade facilitating infrastructure, non-tariff barriers like stringent sanitary and phytosanitary standards requirements, temporary

blockages of certain products by individual Partner States; and increasing importation of conventional agricultural products by EAC Partner States. There is still a gap in differentiation between agroecological products and conventional ones by border market agents in customs and standards compliance, and policy makers at national and regional (EAC) level.

3.0 Main Activity Highlights

3.1 Introduction to the ‘Strengthening Cross-Border Trade in the East African Region for Agroecological Produce’ Project

Ruth Nabaggala, the African Agroecological Entrepreneurship (AAE) project officer at AFSA introduced to the participants the aspirations of the project and its relationship with the study. She noted that with the project aiming at strengthening cross-border trade for agroecological produce, a study to analyze the status of AE products in EA, opportunities, policy and ecosystem challenges, status of consumption, barriers, and enablers was timely. Addressing these impediments would ultimately lead to an increase in the consumption and access of AE products in the EAC.



Ms. Ruth Nabaggala introducing the project

3.2 Opening Remarks

Bridget Mugambe, AFSA’s Program Coordinator, recognized the contribution of SIDA to the project, thanked participants for attending the meeting, and expressed her hope that they had taken the initiative to read through the draft report to make meaningful contributions. While presenting AFSA’s profile, she noted that the organization is operating within the context of biodiversity degradation, worsening climate change, erosion of culture, corporate control of our food system, unplanned urbanization, pandemics, and conflicts, narrative of the green revolution. All these points point to a failure of the contemporary solutions often presented and call for a need to try again the solutions applied and prove successful before respecting nature. She emphasized that to address these challenges, AFSA has established working Groupson strengthening FFMSS, integrating AE into climate change policy spaces, empowering community voices for land rights and healthy soils, and mobilizing citizens’ knowledge and entrepreneurship for sustainable food systems.



Bridget Mugambe Giving her opening remarks

3.3 Opening Remarks from Mr. Ayele Kebede - Regional Development Cooperation Africa, Environment, Climate and Sustainable Natural Resources Management, SIDA.

In his address, Mr. Kebede emphasised the potential of Agroecology to promote food sovereignty in Africa. For example, while the continent's food import bill has more than tripled, reaching about US\$35 billion a year, the continent imports 44% of its wheat from Russia, Ukraine,



Agroecology can reduce this dependence while creating jobs especially for the youths, and small-scale farmers and traders in territorial markets. Ultimately, this would with better regional food market strengthen inter-state collaboration among African neighbours.

He noted that if we're to sustainably solve our food-related challenges, it's imperative to think of internal sources and build our internal systems instead of depending on external sources that are vulnerable to global challenges, over which we have no control; only then shall we be independent.

Policies too, need to be influenced to favor internal production and trade within countries and across borders of African countries, however, if policy makers are to take us serious and consider whatever we're saying as policy material, we need generate empirical evidence, he thus applauded AFSA for taking the initiative to collect data on cross border trade for Agroecological products in East Africa as a basis for influencing policies to favor agroecological produce trade across East African borders.

3.4 Opening Remarks by Hon. Françoise Uwumukiza, Chairperson of the Committee on Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources of the East African Legislative Assembly (EALA)



Hon. Françoise Uwumukiza giving her opening remarks

Hon. Françoise, thanked AFSA for convening actors to discuss important cross-border trade in Agroecology, further remarked that AFSA has been so supportive to the Committee on Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources of the East African Legislative Assembly (EALA), both financially and technically and pledged to continue working AFSA for the betterment of

African food systems and dignity. She noted that agroecology presents vital progress to build resilient economies desired by all EAC countries indeed, amidst climate change, increasing population, upsurge of disease, Agroecology remains the most viable option to struggling East African economies.

To promote cross-border trade in Agroecological products in the EAC, Hon. Françoise called for implementation of the EAC Common Market Protocol. She noted that to ensure that all African countries benefit from the transformative opportunities that Agroecology presents, Africa should be borderless, one people, one country, to allow a smooth, good floor in all countries. *‘Even when it's identifying the challenges as well as opportunities that can accrue to these countries, it can be done together as a borderless continent than each country working in silos. Only when can demand on the EA market be met by mainly small-scale farmers who are the majority producers of agroecological products. We can observe the opportunities and challenges for growing the AE trade in EAC’* she emphasized. She concluded by observing that EALA wants to advocate for a right to food for everyone and leave no one behind. This can easily be met if agroecology is

promoted and embraced in production, trade, and policy circles. Let's use Agroecology to ensure resilient economies.

4.0 Presentation on an overview and appreciation of Agroecology and Related Concepts

Since agroecology was a new concept to many participants, as confessed during the introductory part of the meeting, yet it was the unique feature of the study, Ruth Nabaggala from AFSA took the meeting through an overview of what agroecology is and how it relates to cross-border trade for agroecological products in the EAC.

“Specific agroecological zone, e.g., Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania, initiative to make food systems more sustainable, preserving eco ecosystem, agricultural products, putting on more technology on agriculture, appropriate farming free from fertilizer and to ensure clean agriculture using manure to plant cereals to get clean products.”

She defined Agroecology using the International Panel of Experts on Sustainable Food Systems (IPES-Food) definition i.e., as the science of applying ecological concepts and principles to the design and management of sustainable food systems while emphasizing holistic ecosystem management, blending social, economic, and ecological principles beyond just chemical-free farming. She emphasised that Agroecology offers bottom-up changes to create social movements, food producers, progressive researchers, and other actors to provide an alternative paradigm for food and farming that can address multiple crises in the food system and enable a just transition. Justifying the importance of agroecology, she noted that it provides viable options address contemporary challenges like biodiversity loss, inequalities, and climate change that compound the hunger problem and can't be solved by conventional agricultural practices.

On principles of agroecology, Ms. Nabaggala noted that the 13 principles include recycling, input reduction, soil health, animal health, biodiversity, synergy, economic diversification, co-creation of knowledge, social values, and diets, fairness, land and natural resource governance, and participation. She noted that these principles can foster food sovereignty and cross-border trade in Africa as they encourage local seed systems, circularity in production and consumption system, diversifying food production and diets, promoting health and nutrition, safeguarding natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystem functions, improving soil fertility and soil health, adapting to and mitigating climate change, and preserving local cultures and traditional knowledge system.

In defining food sovereignty, Ms. Nabaggala noted that it is linked to the right to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agriculture systems. Food sovereignty puts the aspirations and needs of those who produce, distribute, and consume food at the heart of food systems and policies rather than the demands of markets and corporations. From a global food systems governance, Ms. Nabaggala noted that food sovereignty offers a strategy to resist and dismantle the current corporate trade and food regime, and directions for food, farming, pastoral, and fisheries systems determined by local producers and users., She highlighted the threats facing Africa's food Sovereignty, such as; Monopolies on seed, land, and food markets, land grabbing, reducing farmers' decision-making circles, climate change impact, and increased dependence on foreign trade. Agroecology can be an antidote to these challenges, she argued, as it ensures that healthy and culturally appropriate food is produced in ecologically and socially sound ways that give communities the power to shape the future of their food systems, rather than being passive observers and recipients of global agricultural trends, this ultimately prevents dependence of communities and in effect countries.

To emphasize that agroecology is the future of food, Mr. John Wilson complemented Ms. Nabaggala's submission with a historical growth of agriculture in Zimbabwe, where small-scale farmers (SSFs) were persuaded and adopted the use of synthetic inputs, but the effects⁵ have seen them go back to agroecology to correct some of the ills created by contemporary agriculture. As of now, most small-scale farmers in Zimbabwe already use livestock manure, cover crops, and composts in their small gardens and plots, most of which are less than three hectares.

4.1 Plenary Discussions

During the plenary discussion, participants appreciated the presentation and shared practical experiences related to agroecology (AE), as well as raising critical concerns and offering suggestions for improvement. The following key issues were raised:

- ✚ **Need for an Enabling Policy Environment for Agroecology:** Participants emphasized the urgent need to create supportive policy frameworks that allow agroecology to thrive. Many countries are currently revising agricultural policies, presenting a timely opportunity for agroecology advocates to engage, mobilize stakeholders, and influence these processes. However, weak implementation and poor mainstreaming of agroecological principles within broader agricultural policies remain a significant challenge across East Africa.
- ✚ **Certification and Market Access Barriers for agroecological products:** Concerns were raised about the challenges AE products face in accessing markets due to inadequate certification protocols. Certifying bodies often lack a full understanding of AE production systems, while producers themselves sometimes employ rudimentary methods resulting in inconsistent quality. It was recommended that certification standards be revised to specifically recognize and accommodate AE products, and that certifiers be sensitized to AE practices and benefits.
- ✚ **Understanding the Breakdown of Traditional Farming Systems:** Participants called for a deeper analysis of why farmers abandoned natural production systems. Possible reasons included climate change, market pressures, propaganda, and perceived inefficiencies of traditional methods. Understanding this shift is essential to designing effective interventions for sustainable food systems in the region.
- ✚ **Disconnect Between Policies and Local Communities:** It was noted that many farmers and traders remain unaware of agroecology and the policies affecting food and AE trade. This is partly due to the use of English-only documents, lack of translation, and limited outreach. Participants stressed the need to leave boardrooms and engage directly with communities to bridge this knowledge gap.
- ✚ **Proliferation of Fake Inputs and Land Grabbing:** There were concerns about the widespread availability of fake agricultural inputs and the rising incidents of land grabbing, particularly in Uganda. These issues hinder both general agricultural activity and the adoption of agroecological practices, undermining food sovereignty and social justice goals.
- ✚ **Dominance of Conventional Agriculture Narratives:** The prevailing discourse in public and policy spaces still favors conventional agriculture. To counter this, participants called for evidence-based advocacy on the negative impacts of industrial food systems and the

⁵ Such as: Synthetic soluble fertilisers have been shown to damage terrestrial and aquatic environments by leaching into underground water sources and surface water bodies (Palaniappan 1995), resulting in increased water hardness and eutrophication

economic and health benefits of agroecology, using media and research to shift public perception and policymaking.

- ✚ **Need for Intra-African Trade and Standards:** Participants expressed frustration over discriminatory practices in European and American markets. Calls were made to prioritize intra-African trade by establishing regionally agreed standards and robust domestic markets to support the growth and trade of AE products within the continent.
- ✚ **Dissemination and Accessibility of AE Case Studies:** AFSA was recognized for having developed valuable case studies, but it was noted that these are not reaching grassroots communities effectively. Members and partners were encouraged to actively participate in the dissemination of these resources to enhance impact.

5.0 Presentation of Study Findings on Agroecological Produce Cross-Border Trade



Africa Kiiza, one of the consultants making his presentation

The two consultants who conducted presented the study report; the report provided insights into the trade in agroecological produce taking place at some border points within the East African Community. Specifically, the border points covered in the study were: Busia (Kenya and Uganda), Mpondwe (Democratic Republic of Congo and Uganda), Namanga- Tarakea (Kenya and Tanzania) and Rusumo (Rwanda and Tanzania).

One of the key findings was the diversity of agroecological products traded in territorial markets on the select borders. At the Busia border agroecological trade is diverse but dominated by cereals and legumes. Maize leads with a total of 146.9 metric tons sold, followed by beans at 92.6 metric tons. Other prominent products include groundnuts (34.6 tons), cassava (17.3 tons), and sorghum (35 tons). Other agroecological products identified in the territorial markets of Busia, Sofia, and Jumuiya were bananas, aerial yams (*dioscorea bulbifera*), beans, sweet potatoes, fish, maize, forest products like honey, medicinal plants and herbs. In Mpondwe, agroecological products identified in the territorial markets of Mpondwe Central Market and Mpondwe-Lhubiriha One-Stop Border Post Market were beans, rice, cabbages, carrots, onions, and tomatoes. Mpondwe exhibits a striking dominance of rice in its agroecological trade, with a staggering volume of 100,000.3 metric tons, vastly surpassing all other products. Beans follow at a distant 1,000.2 tons, reflecting strong demand for staple grains. At the Namanga-Tarakea border avocados are the most traded agroecological product. The research findings indicate that a minimum of thirty-two thousand, five hundred and thirty-eight tons (32,538.60 MTS) of avocados are shipped from Tanzania via Tarakea to Kenya. The next most traded agroecological products are bananas. Based on the research, it is fair to assert that at least 41,310 metric tons are traded annually at this border point. The Rusumo border between Tanzania and Rwanda is a site of significant trade in agroecological products. Based on the information provided by the traders, approximately 10,500 metric tons of cassava are traded annually from Tanzania to Rwanda. Regarding beans, traders export approximately 9000 metric tons of beans from Tanzania to Rwanda.

5.1. Trade Policies: Continental, Regional and National



Dr. Chaka, one of the consultants making his presentation

Study findings revealed that the most significant trade policy at the continental level is the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) which brings together 55 countries of the African union and connects 1.3 billion people into a single free trade area. The signatories to the agreement commit to eliminating tariffs on goods and services over a period of not more than 13 years. The purpose of the agreement is to facilitate trade and thus socio-economic development. With the AfCFTA designed to promote

trade in agricultural products and claims interest in reducing poverty, there are opportunities, which can be used to promote trade in agroecological products.

Study findings also revealed that the EAC policy package does not have any explicit agroecology provisions. Indeed, the EAC treaty is biased towards conventional trade. That said, to the extent that there is a focus on increasing trade in value added products, there is an opportunity to expand trade in agroecological products. Summarily, even when the policies of many EAC countries do not specifically identify agroecology there are potential opportunities for promoting trade in agroecological products. For instance, where trade policies are attentive to promoting micro, small and medium size enterprises, there is likely to be space to promote agroecology. Similarly, when a country's policies claim commitment to strengthening gender equity and for enabling women's empowerment, opportunities in the policy to promote women entrepreneurship, for example, may support agroecologically aligned businesses in production, value addition, transportation and trade. Further, if poverty reduction is a stated objective in policy documents, there may likely be opportunities to advocate for trade in agroecological products as an opportunity to create dignified livelihoods. Addressing youth unemployment and underemployment is increasingly the focus of policy interventions, these too create opportunities where production, transportation and trade in agroecological products can be proposed.

5.2 Socio-economic impact of the trade in agroecological products

Cross-border trade in agroecological products creates opportunities for women and men, youth and people living with disabilities. The study findings do not indicate that the trade in agroecological products is always inherently more financially rewarding. It can be, however, when producers, traders and entrepreneurs can receive premiums. The benefits of agroecological trade are more than financial. The findings suggest that many producers, for example, take pride in the fact that their activities are not detrimental to the environment and is sustainable. This suggests that a benefit of agroecology and the trade in agroecological products is the positive environmental impact. Another benefit of agroecology is the relationships of solidarity and mutuality that it fosters. Interviews with producers, traders, and agroecological entrepreneurs reveal networks that are intentional about the sharing of benefits and oriented towards equity and the collective good.

From a policy perspective, the study proposed recommendations for EAC member countries, CSOs and agroecological entrepreneurs to support cross-border trade for agroecological products in the EAC. Such include Organizing and strengthening farmer organizations.

Improving the identification, verification and traceability of agroecological products; Establishing National Directories of Agroecological Producers, Entrepreneurs, and Products; Disaggregating trade data at Customs to capture agroecological products; Strengthening Value Addition and Transportation, and Improving Trade infrastructure and EAC protocols

5.3. Section on agroecology cross-border trade

While presenting this section, the consultants explained that it was difficult to find produce that observed all the 13 principles of AE, thus as long as produce met 6 out of the 13 principles, it was considered agroecological, further the agroecologicalness of the produce was always expressed by the traders that interacted by the consultants. Further, Mobilization of participants in the study was done by organizations that support Agroecology like PELUM Kenya members that are practicing AE. That way, researchers used purposive sampling by going to farmers that are already agroecology.

Also, of paramount importance to noted was the fact that, some products begin as agroecological at production, post-harvest handling but along the value chain development, they get mixed with conventional produce hence not being purely agroecological produce that reach the consumer.

5.4. Key Issues Arising from the Presentations:

Participants raised the following key issues:

- ✚ **Exclusion of Burundi and South Sudan from the Study:** The study did not cover Burundi and South Sudan, despite their membership in the EAC and presence of small-scale agroecological farmers. Their omission risks market contamination and contradicts the principle of inclusivity. It was recommended that AFSA replicates the study in these countries to ensure regional comprehensiveness and prevent infiltration of conventional produce.
- ✚ **Need to Align with National Policy Updates:** Rwanda's PSTA 5 (2024) addresses many issues raised in the study. It was recommended that the study reviews and aligns findings with updated national strategies to enhance relevance.
- ✚ **Weak Policy Implementation:** While relevant cross-border policies exist, poor implementation, limited awareness among extension workers and politicians, weakens their effect. Moving forward, policy makers should strengthen dissemination and implementation at all levels of governance.
- ✚ **Lack of Frameworks Supporting AE-Oriented Trade:** There is a need to reform initiatives and frameworks managing producers and traders to promote AE in cross-border trade. Governments should therefore deliberately revise trade governance structures to support AE principles.
- ✚ **Data Gaps from Informal Trade Routes:** Concerns were raised about unrecorded data from porous border points and e-commerce platforms. It was recommended that efforts be enhanced to track informal trade and share data collection tools (questionnaires) for transparency.
- ✚ **Use of Informal Routes Due to NTBs and Policy Misalignment:** Traders often use informal routes due to unharmonized policies, NTBs, and corrupt enforcement officers. To resolve this, EAC Partner States should harmonise trade policies, minimize NTBs, and improve enforcement integrity.

5.5 Session Three: Conclusions and Recommendations

The consultants took the participants through the various conclusions and recommendations they made after analyzing the data collected from all the border points they visited, by and large the conclusions were; Organize and strengthen farmer organizations, Improve the identification, verification and traceability of agroecological products, Establish National Directories of Agroecological Producers, Entrepreneurs, and Products, Disaggregate trade data at Customs to capture agroecological products, Strengthen Value Addition and Transportation, Improve Trade infrastructure and EAC protocols.

This triggered participants to suggest further additions on the suggested recommendations, ask questions for clarity while others committing on how they were going to support the implementation of the recommendations as noted below;

- ✚ It's important to note that all agricultural products are exempted from tariffs, thus all the barriers are non-tariff (e.g. excise duty along Kenya -Uganda border), removing them should be one of the strong recommendations the study would have made.
- ✚ Since lack of certification is a significant barrier for AE cross border trade, CSOs, duty bearers should pay extra attention to capacitating SSFs to be eligible for certification on then they can compete with conventional produce that are usually produced to qualities that meet the certification requirements.
- ✚ Relatedly, certification fees need revision, e.g. Testing fee of 900,000Shs for inspection by UNBS in Uganda is nothing but a deterrence to most of the small-scale farmers and small-scale traders. Thus, choose to continue operating illegally.
- ✚ All agroecology actors should seek to ensure that the existing laws, policies and legal frameworks embrace agroecology. We can take advantage of identifying laws being reviewed and influence the inclusion of agroecology as a sustainable way of transforming the food system. If possible, we can seek to cause policies that will favor agroecology in all EAC countries but also at the EAC level.
- ✚ We should have clear strategies on how to ensure that the recommendations reached during the meeting and the findings of the study do not remain in the meeting room but taken to the local level where majority of AE producers are, they should be packaged in languages that common men can easily understand. Only then can meaningful implementation be realized.
- ✚ All border posts should have a system of identifying Agroecological produce from non-Agroecological produce, customs officers Enlighted to appreciate tracing of agroecological produce and properly record without mixing them with conventional produce. Only then can we be sure that the data collected refers to what we intend to collect.
- ✚ All east African have a duty of ensuring that whatever we're doing to ensure produce handled by us are not adulterated especially through additions to hasten drying, increase quantity or increase shelf live. This can only be improved through continuous mass sensitization for mindset change coupled with strick legal enforcement.
- ✚ We should support regional law to support AE at the EAC level which is still in draft form. We should identify the stage at which it is, seek to know the exact support needed and then we collaborate with other partners to ensure its conclusion.

In response, the consultants promised to put all recommendations into consideration as the final report is being worked out.

5.6 Resolutions from this section

- ✚ All AE actors support the conclusion of EAC policy aimed at supporting AE.
- ✚ All AE actors to influence existing trade laws, policies and legal frameworks embrace agroecology.
- ✚ Advocate for the acquisition of appropriate technology at all border posts capable of identifying Agroecological produce from non-Agroecological produce.
- ✚ Continue to capacitate SSFs to produce acceptable standards to be certified as well advocating for charging reasonable fee for certification.

6.0 First Panel Day

The second day opened with two panel discussions with different subject matter specialists as well as practitioners of agroecology weighing in on what is lacking with cross-border trade for agroecological produce and what can be done to improve the same trade.

The first was composed of; Dafa Frank James, Mr. Jonathan Lubega from Uganda, Mr. Onyango Christopher Hugh from COMESA and Mr. Everest Munyapundu from EAC secretariat. All the panelists were giving their insights on the status of cross-border trade for AE produce, what is impeding and what can be done to smooth out this trade. The following issues were raised by the panel:

- ✚ **Lack of Structured Markets and Reliable Data:** There are currently no structured markets for agroecological (AE) produce, and much of the trade occurs informally. As a result, data collection is extremely difficult. Researchers were forced to include any produce that fit some of the 13 AE principles, which may compromise data credibility. It was recommended that EAC Agroecological value web actors should establish formal AE markets to ease data collection and ensure only authentic AE products are included in trade and studies.
- ✚ **Profit-Driven Trade with No Food Safety Considerations:** Cross-border traders prioritize profit over food quality, safety, or the conditions under which products are preserved and transported. It is important to promote awareness that traded goods are food items and must be handled with appropriate safety and hygiene protocols to avoid public health risks.
- ✚ **Contamination Along the AE Supply Chain:** AE products are mixed with conventional produce along the supply chain, risking quality dilution. Partner States should establish dedicated AE trade corridors and exclusive AE market spaces especially in territorial markets to protect product integrity.
- ✚ **Limited Cross-Border Linkages from Territorial Markets:** While territorial markets limit adulteration due to direct farmer participation, their linkages to cross-border trade remain weak and expose AE produce to contamination. Partner States should develop safeguards and traceability systems for AE products transitioning from local to cross-border markets.
- ✚ **Underutilization of Regional Trade Instruments:** COMESA's Simplified Trade Regime (STR) and Green Pass (SPS compliance tool) are under-leveraged in AE trade. EAC Partner States should align AE cross-border trade with STR and explore the Green Pass as a model to support small-scale traders' SPS compliance.

- ✚ **Customs Union and Trade Facilitation:** The study lacks reference to the EAC Customs Union provisions which could support AE trade. It should integrate relevant Customs Union articles, including those on national treatment, to reinforce policy alignment for AE trade.
- ✚ **Persistent Non-Tariff Barriers (NTBs):** While tariffs have been removed, NTBs remain the main constraint for cross-border AE trade. The study should propose actionable strategies to reduce and render NTBs invisible in practice. Eradicating these NTBs is not one man's battle but rather a concerted battle that requires every value web actor to participate since their impact directly or indirectly affects all of the actors.

6.1. 2nd Panel: Policy recommendations

The second panel was composed of; Hon. Uwumukiza Françoise from Rwanda, Chekwot Caiphas from Trappca Tanzania, Naluwooza Mariam Babu a trader from Busia, and NYEMBO LOUIS KITENGE from COMESA. It was intended to focus on policy recommendations that can be adopted to ensure smoother cross-border trade for AE produce in EA.



2nd panel discussion

Submitting first, Nyembo Louis Kitenge insisted that as we seek to promote trade of AE produce, food sovereignty, we should pay particular attention to certification matters at national and regional levels. Unless the produce we want to trade with is certified, it will always be challenging to move it across borders or even sell it from some supermarkets nationally. We need to make certification affordable, but producers are too prepared to produce to allowable qualities.

Further, there's an urgent need to focus on collecting market information and disseminating it to SSFs we work with so they can produce what is demanded in the various markets they are targeting. This will increase their profit and reduce on loss made because of producing what's not needed.

Miss Esther Akenda from Tanzania submitted on challenges AE produce still suffers, i.e., traceability and access to certification. Due to this it's still challenging to sale them in some markets, say EU and America, this calls for an urgent need to assist SSFs and traders to conform to certification requirements in all their production processes only then they can access markets they have been located from hitherto.

She advised that if trade for AE produce is to improve, there is a need to improve policy coherence in all EAC countries; all policies should have common objectives on what, how to produce, and where to sell. Traders still face some barriers due to policy incoherence, leading to fines, physical and tariff barriers in some instances. She noted that, regional level certification will only improve across the borders if there's a common enforcement of good production and manufacturing principles for all the produce and products. Once standardized, getting the products certified will be easier. For now, all actors along different value chains operate in silos leading to mismatch between what is produced and demanded. A clear linkage of actors along the entire value chain till the final consumer will eliminate this mismatch and smooth out production to satisfy the existing demand.

Hon. Uwumukiza Françoise of EALA confirmed to the participants that EALA is assisted by one of her standing committees, on Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources Committee already passed a resolution that AE should be a sustainable approach to promote food sovereignty. She

assured all that this is a clear testimony that EALA is in support of AE as a sure way of transforming the food system in the region.

Further, she informed participants that EALA, in all her plans, encourages countries in the EAC region to promote their local content, e.g., FM Seeds, Broader AE production. All these are good infrastructure to ride on while promoting AE in EAC region so for anything we want from EALA, support is guaranteed.

To support what speakers had submitted before, she submitted that EALA encourages and supports harmonization of cross-border legislation that is critical for the cross-border trade of AE products to flourish.

From the practical point view, Naluwoza Mariam Babu from Busia supported AE as a sure way to improve the lives of youths, women and PWDs hence promoting inclusion in decision making which is a string principle under agroecology.

She observed that though some are still existing, by and large, there have been reduced applications of NTBs, hence facilitating trade more smoothly. This got better with the establishment of one-stop centers, which have provided an enabling environment for small-scale traders to trade across borders.

She encouraged CSOs and other AE actors to establish working partnerships among traders and producers on the different borders where trade takes place, e.g., women's groups that supply those who eventually take the merchandise across the border. This will ensure production responding to market demands, better information flow, creation of a movement that can advocate for their trade rights to cause policy change.

Dr. Chekwot Caiaphas, on his part, noted that all actors in the AE sector need to ensure that all stakeholders across the entire value chain are capacitated on all aspects of acceptable trade. This will ensure that they are cautious while doing their part in the value chain.

He observed that the fact that the entrepreneur's landscape is dominated by small-scale actors makes them vulnerable. Is there any way we can entice large-scale entrepreneurs to invest in AE? This will give them a better influence platform, especially on matters related to do with policy influencing.

One of the things that still hinders the adoption of AE is the prices produce fetches in the markets, all actors need to brainstorm on how to attract a premium for AE produce from the existing markets. This will promote the adoption of practice across the EAC countries.

He challenged all participants to think deeply about a policy framework that needs to be in place to facilitate cross-border trade for AE. E.g., are we to only allow products with added value or primary products or both to cross borders? Also, the policy framework thought about should also talk about the small micro actors to cover financing modes etc., trade finance etc.

6.2 Issues from the plenary

The participants made some contributions to the presentations with some commenting, while others sought clarity on some of the issues raised by the panelists among the salient issues mentioned include.

Maurice Muhoozi, a journalist, wondered how to increase sensitization on AE to small-scale farmers and its benefits.

Many urged that we need to harmonize standards, the process of documentation, and give all suitable small-scale traders permits so they do not think of illegal trading.

6.3 Resolutions from this session

- We need all countries to invest in trade infrastructure at all borders.
- Illegal routes can only be minimized by harmonizing control measures at the borders.

7.0 Group Work

To plan a way forward and agree on actionable points to follow on after the meeting, participants were divided into four (4) groups according to the organizations they work for or affiliated with i.e. CSOs. Traders, government, RECs. All were given the same questions as.

- 1. Select 2 main opportunities you feel this programme can take advantage of and advise how?**
- 2. What are the 2-priority immediate next steps/actions for this programme to build on what has happened and to increase its momentum.**

The responses to the various questions are documented below according to the different categories of participants.

7.1 Regional Economic Communities (RECs)

Opportunities that exist according to this group were identified as;

a) Trade aspect

The existence of the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP)⁶ framework as a continental policy, and recently the Kampala declaration. They both aim to help African countries eliminate hunger and reduce poverty by raising economic growth through agriculture-led development. AE can be a viable system to achieve the objectives of the framework.

The African Continental Free Trade Area (AFCFTA)⁷: Signatories committed to eliminating tariffs on most goods and services. This agreement opens the door to cross-border trade of AE produce. EAC framework⁸: through the common market union, customs union pillar, Simplified trade regime all are supportive to cross border trade that AE can take advantage of to promote its border crossing.



Recs Representatives in their Group discussions

Parliamentary Network Africa (PNAfrica)⁹: civil society organization with a Vision of Promoting Open Parliaments across Africa and a Mission of working with Parliamentary Institutions and citizens, including CSOs and the media, to promote transparency, accountability, civic participation, inclusion, and responsiveness in the work of African parliaments. This can easily be rode on to formulate AE supportive policies in the entire continent.

b) Private sector: AE can take advantage of existing cross-border trade associations to seek more adoption and inclusion in the legal frameworks.

⁶ <https://caadp.org/>

⁷ <https://www.eac.int/trade/international-trade/trade-agreements/african-continental-free-trade-area-afcfta-agreement>

⁸ <https://www.eac.int/regional-framework/institutional-framework>

⁹ <https://parliamentafrica.com/about-us/>

c) Legislature: EALA has already passed resolutions to support agroecology; only implementation needs to be followed up.

d) Arable land: By and large, all EAC countries have sizable amounts of land that is still arable and that can support agriculture without much external additions. AE is still possible in most EAC countries.

These can be taken advantage of since they already have provisions that support either AE or climate change or food insecurity or poverty reduction, all of which can be used to argue out the effectiveness of AE as a viable solution to the identified social, economic challenges, hence promoting it.

Further, since all the identified structures and policy frameworks above are already in support of cross border trade, AE cross border trade would benefit from this window to promote its cross-border trade without seeking further policy change.

QN.2. On the next steps, Recs representatives pledged to;

- ✚ Continue with sensitization, awareness creation on the benefits of AE to the economy and health of the communities. Strategies to employ include: finding a head of state to be the champion of AE producing idea, Rwanda's head of state is the prime target, creation and support of demonstration plots – TOTs first batch will be encouraged to be very active to convince the communities around marginalized groups participation.
- ✚ Support the improvement on the Management of AE produce to identify them from the selling points of supermarkets and local markets.

7.2 Government Group

For the government group, opportunities identified according to the group include;

- ✚ Growing demand for AE produce from all EAC countries, this is as a result of increased awareness on the economic and health benefits of these foods.
- ✚ Investment in infrastructure that supports AE. Generally, all EAC countries have realized that they need to promote AE, which has led to the initiation of its inclusion in their public infrastructure, e.g., extension services, but a lot remains undone for full adoption.

These can be taken advantage of in the following ways;

- ✚ Creation/strengthening of AE produce specialized markets in all the EAC countries, which will easily link to the cross-border markets for AE produce.
- ✚ Provision of Incentives such as affordable storage facilities, affordable transportation services so traders can access markets at a reasonable price/s
- ✚ Support research on the effectiveness of AE and disseminate it so it can be used for policy making, hence the creation of an enabling environment
- ✚ Continue supporting the involvement of the youth and women in AE production and trading by intervening on the barriers for their involvement like limited access to information, capital, machinery etc...
- ✚ Support the formation and operationalization of farmer groups and cooperatives engaged in AE production and trade across all EAC countries.

Priorities for next stage

- ✚ Establish a regional technical working group on the promotion of cross-border AE trade.
- ✚ Launch and support pilot cross-border AE trade corridors
- ✚ Develop regional awareness campaigns on the relevance of AE.
- ✚ Capacity building for all border stakeholders on the value of AE produce and identification of this produce from the conventional produce.
- ✚ Strengthening research and technology uptake with a bias on AE promotion

7.3 Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)

For CSOs, opportunities identified according to the group include;

- Ability to influence policy frameworks (development and implementation), Capacity to leverage digital platforms to promote cross-border trading



CSOs in the discussion Group

- ✚ Possibility of coming together as actors in the EAC to advocate for a common cause.
- ✚ The EAC agroecology strategy developments, with two countries concluded theirs and Uganda in the final stages of concluding hers.
- ✚ Development of an agroecology standard in some countries with the opportunity that others will soon follow suit.
- ✚ Ability to mobilize SSFs into farmer groups to facilitate market access and compliance.

- ✚ Existence of a national CSO agroecology actor's platform in all EAC countries, these can easily be linked together to form the EAC agroecology actor's platform.
- ✚ Presence of like-minded organizations promoting AE in the EAC region to influence policy (development and implementation)
- ✚ With the presence of a wide range of agroecology value chain actors, these can be easily mobilized for other purposes needed to cause change in the AE trade area.

These can be taken advantage of in the following ways;

- Advocacy always benefits from numbers, having actors in large numbers across the borders would be great basis to advocate for the inclusion of AE in the policies, frameworks and operations of EAC governments.
- The existence of policy processes in pipeline provides a good starting point to influence the inclusion of AE in them instead of starting entirely new processes as this is a reserve of government.

Priorities for next Action

- ✚ Developing operational frameworks and seeking to influence their revision to embrace Agroecology if they are not already embracing it.
- ✚ Identify the agroecology actors' platforms already existing and identify capacity gaps in the existing platforms, and create awareness in these platforms
- ✚ Conducting stakeholder mapping of all EAC agroecology actors and documenting them with a view of establishing an actor's platform for the EAC region and developing an EAC reporting and feedback mechanism to monitor what each actor is doing in the promotion of cross-border trade.
- ✚ Follow up on the process of the EAC AE strategy and ensure its conclusion as well as its application after, which will involve mobilizing funds for the process to develop the strategy, conducting stakeholder sensitization and awareness
- ✚ Capacitation of agroecology actors/institutions and seek to customize the available organic certification standard to include AE, revising the existing policies to address concerns for SSFs practicing AE, and carrying out budget advocacy to ensure deliberate allocation for AE promotion.
- ✚ Leverage on PGS to facilitate access to certification for cross-border trade and compliance. More PGS to be created and supported to operate, linked to each other in different EAC countries to cheaply guarantee quality of AE produce in the region.
- ✚ Mobilize and strengthen farmer groups to facilitate market access and compliance

7.4 Traders

For traders, opportunities identified according to the group include.



Traders in their discussion group

- Organized farmer, trader associations and entrepreneurship groups for easy collaboration and linkage establishment for the promotion of AE in the region.
- Presence of markets that are already selling AE produce, hence a firm basis to motivate AE producers of AE produce in the region.

These can be taken advantage of in the following ways;

- Capacity building for cross-border traders, SSFs, and entrepreneurs on AE
- Creation of market linkages between farmer groups and traders

Priorities for the next stage

- Training traders and farmers about the 13 principles of AE
- Identification of the target groups – farmers, traders, entrepreneurs, and other stakeholders and seek to work together as a team following the principles of agroecology.

8.0 Closing remarks

On behalf of AFSA, Bridget Mugambe thanked all participants for attending the meeting, their meaningful contributions and promised that their contributions will be used to enrich the report and all the people that attended will form a formidable team to lean on to implement the project.



She noted that AFSA has strength in convening like-minded people to think and work together for the benefit of the communities we serve.

She concluded by recognizing the financial contribution from SIDA as well as the Kenyan government for allowing

the meeting to happen.

On his part, Sunday Bob Goerge from MAAIF thanked AFSA for convening stakeholders and facilitating the research that was being validated. He, however, noted that all parties involved should endeavor to put all recommendations to practice otherwise the time spent conducting research and validating it would go to waste.



He consoled consultants that all critiques given are meant to enrich the study and should be taken as so and get the study improved on.