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The Bioenergy and Food Security Project

**BEFS Objective**: Mainstreaming food security concerns into national and sub-national assessments of bioenergy potential.

- **Phase 1**: Develop analytical framework and guidance to assess the bioenergy and food security nexus
- **Phase 2**: Implement the methodology in the country based on country specific data
- **Phase 3**: Strengthen country capacity, exchange knowledge, feed into policy development and standard setting

**BEFS Partners**: Peru, Tanzania and Thailand
What BEFS assesses and how

Main links:
- Availability
- Access

Bioenergy ➔ Food Security

Potential (Suitability)
Technoeconomic feasibility
Module 1 and 2

Food Production
Food Access
Modules 3, 4 and 5 building on Module 1 and 2
BEFS Analytical Framework

Fed with COUNTRY SPECIFIC DATA

1. Biomass Potential

2. Biomass Supply Chain Production Costs

3. Agriculture Markets Outlook

4. Economy wide Effects

5. Household level Food Security

Supporting national policy development

Irini Maltsoglou and David Dawe

Mirella Salvatore, Amir Kassam, Mario Bloise and Michela Marinelli

Erika Felix and the University of Manizales Colombia

James Thurlow, IFPRI, with input from BEFS

COSIMO Team, with input from BEFS
Economic Indicators (2005)
GDP/Capita (Constant 2000 Int$, PPP) 662
GDP Growth 7.0%
Agriculture Share 44.5% , revised to 26%
Percent of rural population 75.8%

Current energy supply mix (IEA, 2004)
More than 90 percent of national energy supply comes from biomass, mostly woody
Petroleum and electricity are imported and make up for approximately 7 percent of energy supply
Some local hydro, gas and coal production, 1 percent

Current energy use in the country
Energy use per capita in Tanzania is 498 ktoe/capita (versus 703 ktoe/capita in Africa and 1793 ktoe/capita in the World, WDI 2007)
Based on the household budget survey of 2001, 10 percent of households have access to electricity, this swivels down to 1 percent in rural areas
Which commodities do we focus on in Tanzania?

- **Potential bioenergy feedstock-Government’s indications:**
  - Ethanol: *Sugar* and *Cassava*
  - Biodiesel: *Palm oil and Jatropha*

- **Food security commodities:**
  Selected based on calorie consumption data.
  Main focus on *Maize* and *Cassava*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Calorie Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rice (Milled Equivalent)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sorghum</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sweet Potatoes</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sugar (Raw Equivalent)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Palm Oil</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Beverages, Fermented</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Milk – Excluding Butter</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bovine Meat</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pulses, Other</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Plantains</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Millet</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal share for selected items</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Calories per capita</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FAOSTAT
## Net trade position for key commodities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Production quantity (MT)</th>
<th>Import quantity (MT)</th>
<th>Export quantity (MT)</th>
<th>Net-importer</th>
<th>Net-exporter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>3,288,000</td>
<td>44,500</td>
<td>98,985</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>7,061,867</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>957,000</td>
<td>18,846</td>
<td>3,717</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>87,133</td>
<td>254,732</td>
<td>36,428</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum</td>
<td>653,644</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet potatoes</td>
<td>781,567</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Cane</td>
<td>1,374,633</td>
<td>140,895</td>
<td>27,537</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm oil</td>
<td>63,333</td>
<td>117,272</td>
<td>6,464</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>261,667</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>9,253</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banana</td>
<td>2,007,480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FAOSTAT
Determining the biomass potential

**Land Suitability Assessment Model** and consists of two components:

1) the **Land Resources Inventory**: biophysical information is compiled such as temperature, rainfall, soil and land-form

2) the **Land Suitability Assessment**. Once the inventory is set up, identify crop suitability areas based on climatic and soil-related criteria. This assessment requires the identification of the **land utilization types** (LUTs), which are a combination of crop type, production system (tillage-based and conservation agriculture) and input level (low and high).

Crops: cassava, sugar cane, sweet sorghum, oil palm and sunflower Having determined suitable areas by crop and based on the attainable yield, the potential production is calculated. In this, non-agricultural and environmentally sensitive areas (such as forest areas, protected areas, urban areas, etc.) are excluded. An evaluation of the potential competition with food production is undertaken using land cover, land use and agriculture statistics.

Irrigation and infrastructure

To date the analysis is showing that infrastructure access will be one of the key parameters to enable the country to reap the benefits from the development of bioenergy schemes.
Suitability index for cassava

Tillage-Based Agriculture

Conservation Agriculture

Suitability classes
- Very Suitable (80-100%)
- Suitable (60-80%)
- Moderately Suitable (40-60%)
- Marginally Suitable (20-40%)
- Very Marginally Suitable (< 20%)
- Not Suitable

- Inland water bodies
- Excluded areas
- Region administrative boundaries
Production costs of biomass supply chains (Module 2)

- Each feedstock is assessed under different processing conditions based on the relevance of the following characteristics for the feedstock analyzed:
  - (i) stand alone versus integrated mill and refinery
  - (ii) plant scale: large, medium or small
  - (iii) feedstock origin: (a) commercial, (b) outgrowers (c) a mix of these two

- Based on the relevant mix of (i), (ii) and (iii), this part of the assessment evaluates technical and economic aspects of biofuel production taking into account the local knowledge base and manufacturing capacity.
An example:
Production cost cassava ethanol in Tanzania

- Comparison of medium (~160K liters/day) and large (~300K liters/day) refinery technologies including co-products credit (biocompost, biofertilizers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input costs</th>
<th>Medium-size (fresh)</th>
<th>Medium-size (dry)</th>
<th>Large-size (dry)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw material</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$0.064</td>
<td>$0.064</td>
<td>$0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost at plant</td>
<td>$0.42</td>
<td>$0.47</td>
<td>$0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution costs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>$0.46</td>
<td>$0.51</td>
<td>$0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>$0.54</td>
<td>$0.59</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agriculture Market Outlook (Module 3)

**Module 3** focuses on the domestic agriculture markets

- It is based on the 10 outlook produced by AGLINK COSIMO
- This Module analyses the impacts of bio-fuel production and bio-fuel policies on agricultural markets in the context of selected country over a 10 year period by providing an outlook for international and national agricultural commodity markets and simulates a set of scenarios
- Allows to assess
  - What is the outlook for main food corps in Tanzania under different conditions including International agriculture and biofuel policies?
  - What are the implications of domestic and global biofuel policies for biofuel development in Tanzania?
The Outlook in Tanzania

• **Baseline Outlook:** Overall, the projections show that for most crops (the ones that Tanzania receives most of its calories from) the country will have to rely on more imports to meet domestic demand and this is in the absence of biofuels markets.

• **Scenario 1:** Blending mandates 49 million litres of ethanol (10%) and 55 million litres of biodiesel (5%) by 2017, no land expansion

• **Scenario 2:** Based on investors requests for land (314,000 ha) for biofuel development, ethanol production would reach 800 Mlt in 2017 and biodiesel 695 Mlt. Biofuel production would exceed domestic demand and be directed to exports.
Outlook in Tanzania (contd.)

• The biofuels blending mandate does not require a significant amount of biofuels feedstocks and it could be possible to meet these mandates with limited expansion of cultivated lands and moderate increase in average yields.

• Based on investors requests for land for biofuel development, ethanol production would reach 800 Mlt in 2017 and biodiesel 695 Mlt. Biofuel production would exceed domestic demand and be directed to exports.

• Total production would by far exceed domestic demand and would heavily rely on EU and EBA agreement.
Economy wide effects

- National dynamic computable general equilibrium model
- Based on 2007 economy wide database (social accounting matrix)
- Survey-based microsimulation module for poverty-effects
- New feedstock and biofuels sectors in the model are based on Module 2’s technologies and production cost estimates

- The model is run forward for the period 2007-2015
- Initially tracks recent demographic and growth trends
- Then simulates different biofuel production scenarios or options:
  - Feedstock (sugarcane/molasses vs. cassava)
    - Scale of production (large estates vs. smallholder outgrower schemes)
    - Source of production (land expansion/displacement vs. yield improvements)
    - Scale of biofuel processing (small plants vs. single large-scale plant)
Some of the economy wide effects in Tanzania

• Biofuel production accelerates growth and poverty reduction
• There is no medium to long-run food/fuel trade-off
  ✓ An appreciating exchange rate from expanding biofuels exports (or reducing fuel imports) hurts existing traditional agricultural exports
  ✓ Tanzania’s large existing export crop sector means that food production remains ‘unaffected’ by land/labor displacement for biofuel crops
✓ Engaging more smallholder farmers strengthens poverty-effects
  ✓ Outgrower sugarcane schemes are currently not a cost-effective option
  ✓ But smallholder cassava is cost-effective and is also more pro-poor
  ✓ Improving yields rather than displacing cultivated lands makes sugarcane and cassava outgrower schemes equally pro-poor and more cost-effective
• Switching to small-scale sugarcane processing plants has only small additional employment- and poverty-effects
Short run effects on households’ access to food-- Some reminders

- Bioenergy developments one of the causes of food price increases
- Changes in food prices can derive from international and domestic supply and demand shocks including biofuels’ demand.
- What matters for households are domestic price increases, whereby domestic prices can change due to international and national price movements depending on policies, exchange rate movements, level of price transmission etc..

- Price increases will affect different groups in different ways:
  - *Net consumers*: Those who buy more food than they sell will be hurt by higher prices.
  - *Net producers*: Those who sell more food than they buy benefit from higher prices.
Measurement of household level net welfare impacts

• The impact of a price change on household welfare can be decomposed into:
  ✓ the impact on the household as a consumer of the good and
  ✓ the impact on the household as a producer of the good.

The net welfare impact will be the difference between the two
Kilimanjaro

- Maize

- Cassava
Ruvuma

- Maize
- Cassava
Maize and Cassava Price Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity and Marketing Level</th>
<th>Domestic Retail Fresh Cassava</th>
<th>Domestic Retail Dried Cassava</th>
<th>Domestic Maize Wholesale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Percent Change Between 2003 and 2008</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Trade, Calculations by the authors
Which commodities do we focus on in Peru?

- **Potential bioenergy feedstock—Government’s indications:**
  - ✓ Ethanol: **Sugar** and **sweet sorghum**
  - ✓ Biodiesel: **Palm oil** and **jatropha**

- **Food security commodities:**
  Selected based on calorie consumption data.
  Main focus on **rice, sugar and wheat**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Calorie share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rice (Milled Equivalent)</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sugar (Raw Equivalent)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Soyabean Oil</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Milk - Excluding Butter</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Plantains</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fish, Body Oil</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Poultry Meat</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Beverages, Alcoholic</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pulses, Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Palm Oil</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fruits, Other</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subtotal share for selected items*: 84.4
*Total Calories per capita*: 2176

Source: FAOSTAT
Overview of Energy and Economy in Peru

- **Energy Matrix**
  Petróleo y Gas Natural 67.6%, Biomasa 15 %, Hidroenergia 12%, Carbón Mineral 5%, Otros 0.4 %

**Fuentes:** MINEM-OGP
Welfare impact for a 10% producer price increase for rice
## Producer price changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Real percentage price changes 2006-2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar (White, brown) *</td>
<td>-37 , -57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potato</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White maiz</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on the wholesale price

Source: Author calculations based on INEI data
Country project set up and institutional framework

- Country team
- Bioenergy task force
- Feeding into national policy
- Training activities
Where BEFS stands

• Wrapping up the country assessments, using the technical analysis components to feed into the domestic policy dialogue while considering country institutional constraints

• Training in the country on BEFS Modules methodology: Different issues in different countries

• Supporting domestic policymakers with the two activities above to feed into the National Biofuels Taskforce
A list of requirements for the sustainability of bioenergy developments

- The preliminary conclusions drawn by the BEFS project indicate that **bioenergy development which safeguards food security is only sustainable if it**
- does not hinder the natural resource base
- involves smallholders, increases employment and takes into account the specific risks for subsistence farmers
- increases access to markets and infrastructure
- builds domestic skills and expertise
- ensures localized benefits and the long term sustainability of the industry
- monitors welfare impacts at the household level
- respects and protects the livelihoods of women
- strengthen farmers associations to ensure fair contract arrangements and full information
- further enhances institutional capacity to support the new industry
- The assessment results contain details on how to achieve this.
Concluding remarks

• BEFS can show which areas should be developed for biofuel production, whilst accounting for food production and environmental constraints
• BEFS can show implications for the economy, labour, poverty and which segments of the population will loose or will gain

    ....nevertheless, the success of sustainable bioenergy developments will heavily rely on meticulous managements and, as generally for agriculture, on investment in infrastructure, agriculture R&D and human capital development...
THANK YOU!

www.fao.org/bioenergy/foodsecurity/befs

Irini Maltsoglou, BEFS FAO
• Propose an alternative calculation for consumer price percentage change accounting for the margin assumption

• Include for purchasing power differences across rural and urban areas
• Include for crop to food transformation chain