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Objectives of the Survey

• To identify impediments to development of cotton by-products;
• To understand infrastructure & technologies available at each activity step of the VC;
• To understand producers' demographic and income profiles, margins and cost drivers from cotton and cotton by-product activities;
• To understand the perceptions, mind-sets and views of each VC actor about development of cotton by-products;
• To understand the main motivation of the value chain actors' decision to invest or not in cotton by-products; and
• To identify incentives for motivating farmers, ginners, spinners and other actors to develop cotton by-products.
Methodology

• Documents review;
• Key informant interviews with ginners, oil expressers, feed manufacturers, farmers’ unions, AMA and Ministry of Industry & Commerce;
• Interviews with 233 farmers in Gokwe, Muzarabani, Chiredzi and Bindura;
• Country case study of Uganda.
Stage

Farming

Ginning

Main product

Seed cotton

Cotton seed

Lint

By-product

Cotton stalks

Cottonseed meal/cake

Cottonseed oil

Cotton hulls

Cotton linters
Potential Commercial uses of Cotton by-Products & Gaps in Zimbabwe

Potential commercial uses of cotton stalks:

- A source of fuel (briquettes)
- Production of corrugated boxes for packaging
- Fibreboard manufacture for partition boards and furniture
- Production of kraft paper

- Cotton stalks availability: **average of 383,500 tonnes/year**;

- In Zimbabwe the stalks have no commercial value.
Potential commercial uses of cottonseed:

- Seed multiplication (planting cotton seed)
- Feed manufacturing (1% of raw material for feed)
- Oil expression (oil is 18% of seed value)
- Cottonseed meal (44% of seed value)
- Linters
- Hulls
- Gums for lecithin production for margarine
- Exports

- In Zimbabwe cottonseed has commercial value in seed multiplication, feed manufacturing, oil expression and exports;
- A tonne of cottonseed produces 200kg of oil, 500kg of cottonseed meal and 300kg of hulls.
Potential Commercial Uses of Linters

– Manufacture of cellulose products (e.g. cellulose acetate, carboxymethly cellulose, viscose rayon, microcrystalline cellulose, cellulose nitrate);
– Preparation of specialty-grade paper;
– Exports;
– Produce receipt books and security paper, including currency paper for the Government;
– Linters constitute 7% of cottonseed value;

• In Zimbabwe linters are exported only without being value added; they once were value added into receipt book, security & currency paper.
Potential Commercial Uses of Motes

– Produce non-woven products such as those produced using linters;
– Used in cushions for sofas and chairs;
– In Zimbabwe motes are being used by furniture manufactures to make cushions for sofas and chairs;
Potential Commercial Uses of Cotton Seed Oil

- Cooking oil
- Margarine
- Soaps & detergents
- Candles

- In Zimbabwe cottonseed oil is only being used for cooking oil.
Potential commercial uses of hulls

– Feed manufacturing;
– Mixed with cottonseed meal to create a higher density product that is easier to transport and handle;
– Blended with the meal to provide roughage;
– In Zimbabwe hulls are used in feed manufacturing and sold as scrap to customers who use it as fuel.
Potential Commercial uses of Cotton Seed Meal

– Feed manufacturing (1% to 2% of raw materials and 12% to 13% of the total costs)
– Used as a natural fertiliser for acid loving plants (e.g. camellias, blueberries)
– Exports
– In Zimbabwe cottonseed meal is mainly used in feed manufacturing and for export.
Cottonseed Meal Fertilizer

Natural source of nitrogen, phosphate, and potash that helps create an acidic soil condition and aids in production of friendly soil bacteria.
Relative Importance of Cotton Meal in Stockfeed Manufacturing

- Maize
- Soya products
- Cotton products
Impediments to Cotton by-Products Value Addition

Cotton Stalk
– Lack of knowledge among farmers and VC actors;
– Lack of necessary value addition technologies;
– Competition from cheaper imports e.g. kraft paper, renders investment in local production risky;

Motes and Linters
– Insufficient quantities to achieve economies of scale;
– Low cotton production;
– Side marketing, reducing ginners’ willingness to invest;
– Poor yields;
– Declining number of cotton farmers;
Cottonseed Meal & Hulls
- Availability of pastures for ruminant animals;
- Lack of cost-effective technologies to extract gossypol;

Margarine
- Not cost effective,
- Insufficient volumes of oil for household and industrial use.

Soaps & detergents
- Dark colouring and foul-smelling requires extra additives which reduce viability,
- There are prohibitive costs to clean and purify the soap,
- Availability of cost effective substitutes,
- Limited availability of seed cotton oil.

Candles
- Low wax content,
- Limited quantities of oil,
- Costly technology,
- Uneconomical as it requires additional chemicals,
- Availability of cheaper alternatives.
Infrastructure & Technology

Generally available but needs further investments

- Cotton Research Institute and Quton have infrastructure for Seed breeding, agronomy, entomology and pathology
- Cottco, Alliance and Olam have seed multiplication infrastructure
- Ginners generally have state-of-the-art ginneries with underutilized total capacity of 440,600 tonnes per year
- State-of-the-art equipment for cooking oil manufacturing (e.g. Surface Wilmar has cutting edge equipment)
- State-of-the-art equipment for feed manufacturing (e.g. Agrifoods cutting-edge equipment, with underutilized capacity of 4,000 tonnes per day)

Gaps in Infrastructure & Technologies

- Poor agronomic practices (e.g. late plantings, low plant populations, poor weeding, incorrect application of chemicals, improper harvesting, non-use of fertilizers);
- Low level of mechanisation in cotton production;
- De-waxing of cottonseed oil to produce candle wax
STAKEHOLDER PERCEPTIONS
Farmers’ perceptions

**What farmers do with stalks**

- Cut & burn: 96.1%
- Make manure: 7.3%
- Feed for cattle: 0.9%
- Use as fuel: 0.4%

**Current value addition initiatives**

- Nothing: 82%
- Grading: 18%
Potential value addition initiatives at farm gate level

- Oil expression: 20.8%
- Making cattle feed: 13.3%
- Micro ginning: 5.3%
- Contract ginning: 5.3%
- Other: 0.9%
- No idea: 72.6%
Factors hampering cotton production

- low producer prices 92.5%
- high input costs 37.3%
- erratic rainfall 30.7%
- shortage of inputs 25.9%
- shortage of draught power 18%
- shortage of inputs 9.9%
- short payment of farmers by ginners 9.9%
- politicization of the input scheme 9.9%
- use of force by ginners in recoveries 2.6%
- cheating by ginners on inputs & others 3.9%
- late disbursement of inputs 4.4%
- labour intensive 4.4%
- reduced labour due to urbanisation 4.4%
- chemicals used endanger lives 4.8%
- emergency of competing crops 5.3%
- poor agronomic practices 5.7%
- side marketing 1.8%
- reduced labour due to urbanisation 4.4%
- late payments of farmers by ginners 4.4%
- abuse of inputs 4.4%
- using force by ginners in recoveries 4.4%
- unfair distribution of inputs 0.4%
- unknown pests difficult to control 0.4%
- late disbursement of inputs 0.4%
- reduced labour due to urbanisation 0.4%
Contribution of Cotton to Income

0% - 20%: 22.6%
21% - 40%: 13.1%
41% - 60%: 13.7%
61% - 80%: 19.6%
81% - 100%: 31.0%
Perception on Prices

- Unstable: 0.4%
- Fair: 36.6%
- Unviable: 63.4%

Elements Considered in Price Setting

- Input costs: 48.0%
- Not sure: 43.7%
- International lint prices: 13.1%
- Quality of cotton: 2.6%
- Supply and demand for cotton: 0.9%
Farmer-Ginner Relationship

- Relationship is good
- Relationship is bad
- Relationship is very bad

Factors contributing to the relationship:
- **Bad due to mistrust between giners and farmers**
- **Bad due to lack of transparency in price setting**
- **Bad due to non-payment of grade price adjustments**
- **Bad due to forceful recovery of input costs**
- **Bad due to inflated inputs costs**
- **Bad due to inadequate input supplies**
- **Bad because CGA does not like competition**
- **Bad due to late input disbursement**
- **Bad due to politicization of the input scheme**
- **Bad due to non-payment of cash on delivery**
- **Bad due to non-fulfilment of promises**
- **Bad due to ginners' inferior treatment of farmers**
- **Bad due to ginners' non-consultation of farmers**
- **Bad due to unfair distribution of inputs**
- **Bad due to mistrust between ginners and farmers**
- **Bad due to lack of transparency in price setting**
- **Bad due to non-payment of grade price adjustments**
- **Bad due to forceful recovery of input costs**
- **Bad due to inflated inputs costs**
- **Bad due to inadequate input supplies**
- **Bad because CGA does not like competition**
- **Bad due to late input disbursement**
- **Bad due to politicization of the input scheme**
- **Bad due to non-payment of cash on delivery**
- **Bad due to non-fulfilment of promises**
- **Bad due to ginners' inferior treatment of farmers**
- **Bad due to ginners' non-consultation of farmers**
- **Bad due to unfair distribution of inputs**
Farmers' Views on How to Control Side Marketing

- Equalize prices across ginners
- Ginners should set favourable prices
- Provision of adequate inputs on time
- Stiffer penalties for side marketing
- Control ginners to only buy crop they financed
- Set producer prices before planting
- Let farmers buy own inputs
- Contractors to monitor cotton at home before...
- Uniformity of input schemes
- Paying farmers on time
- No idea
- Extensive farmer training to appreciate contracts
- Ginners should pool resources and share the...
- Adopt the auction system
- Make payment plans for input credit
- Offer cash or make uniform the mode of...
- Having one buyer per area
- Common buying points
- Ginners must honour their promises
GINNERS’ PERCEPTIONS

There is scope for more cotton by-product value addition:

– Oil expression;
– Seed multiplication for export;

Inhibitors of by-product value addition:

– Insufficient volumes of cotton production
– Limited market for finished by-products
– Lack of and high cost of capital discourages investment;
– Stiff competition from inexpensive imports displaces local production;
OIL EXPRESSERS’ PERCEPTIONS

• Acknowledge that cotton by-product value chain is underdeveloped;

• Their decision to invest depends mainly on availability of cottonseed as a raw material in sufficient quantities for economies of scale;

• Inhibitors of by-product value addition;
  – Limited availability of cottonseed
  – Cottonseed oil is dark, need new technology to purify/lighten it;
  – Such investments lead to preference of soya over cotton oilseed;

• Cotton oilseed has advantage of high smoke point that enables it to withstand a higher temperature than many other edible oils before burning or dissipating.
FEED MANUFACTURERS PERCEPTIONS

Optimistic of bright prospects for using cotton by-products:

– Huge interest in raising goats due to high demand from Asian markets (1,000 goats/day);
– Presidential Input Scheme & Command Agriculture-boosting production;

Inhibitors of by-product value addition

– Limited local demand for beef and dairy feed products
– Need for foreign currency, oil expressers prefer to export cottonseed meal to earn foreign currency, despite unsatisfied local demand for cake
– Limited local availability of vitamins, minerals and other additives
– Low volume of cotton production vs other competing crops;
– Potential risk of overpricing of cotton by-products due to the dominance of one ginner in buying cotton during the 2016/17 marketing season;
FARMERS’ UNIONS’ PERCEPTIONS

Inhibitors of by-product value addition:
- Limited scale of seed cotton production
- Lack of appropriate small-scale technology- enhancing productivity & on farm value addition
- Lack of initiatives (e.g. cooperatives) that assemble required critical mass of raw materials;
- Lack of knowledge on potential value addition activities

Inhibitors of seed cotton production:
- Unfavourable prices that de-incentivize production;
- Poor agronomic practices;
- Non-adoption of efficient seed technologies (e.g. biotechnology cotton);
- Cotton contracting system is tilted in favour of the buyers;
- Inadequate input packages provided by ginners;
- High input costs of production compared to other countries;
- Registration requirements with several institutions that are not centralized
- Cotton planting seed not readily available in retail shops
AMA’S PERCEPTIONS

Factors underpinning decline in production:
– Low productivity
– Inadequate input packages
– Late disbursement of inputs adversely affect yields;
– Low lint price due to heavy subsidies by major world producers;

Initiatives to promote production:
– Regulatory framework that ensure fairness and transparency in funding, production and marketing of seed cotton;
– Free input scheme;

Regulatory challenges:
– Ginners don’t submit their returns on input funding, resulting in difficulties in implementing the quota system;
Ministry of Industry’s Perceptions

Challenges hindering development of cotton by-products:
- Lack of adequate downstream value addition infrastructure;
- **Weak enabling policy and institutional environment** to support the development of cotton by-products industries;
- Poor market information on cotton by-products;
- Lack of data to **assess viability** of opportunities for investments;

Initiatives to Promote Value Addition
  • Seeks to improve the management and packaging of cotton by-products such as **cotton motes and linters**,  
  • Seeks to incentivize development of new products such as special paper from linters and other products such as **soap and margarine**
- Development of a **seed cotton pricing model** that rewards quality and contamination free cotton
- Promulgation of Statutory Instrument (SI) 64 of 2016 to promote value addition;
Concluding Recommendations

• Capacity building and knowledge sharing / awareness on full potential value addition to cotton and cotton-by-products.

• Incentives for boosting farmers’ productivity, to create economies of scale for value added activities on cotton-by-products.

• Policy incentives to encourage investment in or adoption of technologies to add value to cotton stalks (e.g. tax credits, SEZ status)

• Building capacity of state actors and industry players to address side marketing
• Development and multiplication of seed varieties that result in improving yields
• Investing in the technology to remove gossypol from the cottonseed meal
• Set viable cotton producer prices and improve transparency in the determination of cotton producer prices to eliminate mistrust between farmers and ginners
• Provision of adequate input packages comprising of fertilizer, seed, chemicals and tillage support
• Adoption of similar modes of payment (i.e. cash, eco-cash and electronic transfers) and a consensus based public pricing formula as a strategy for avoiding side marketing;

• Reduce farmers’ transaction costs by making all cotton inputs readily available in retail shops and reducing the costs of the farmer registration process;

• Rebalance the cotton contracting system which is currently tilted in favour of the contractors, with an adverse effect on farmers’ incentives to grow cotton
• Explore and adapt the Ugandan model of a **common fund for input provision** to the Zimbabwean context to address crowding out and side marketing

• Effective monitoring by Ginners technical staff to ensure that inputs provided are accurate for the targeted hectarage and that distribution of inputs is based on **historical performance** of the farmer rather than **the** hectarage that the farmer intends to plant.
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