



Aflatoxins: A Threat to Competitiveness of EAC Agricultural Produce and Products in the Domestic and International Markets

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the EAC Region, food crops and their products that are produced, consumed or traded in large quantities with high degree of susceptibility to aflatoxin include maize, groundnuts, cashew, sesame, and rice.

The potential economic and trade-related impacts of aflatoxin contaminated products in domestic and international markets can be significant.

In the domestic market, the direct economic impact of aflatoxin contamination in crops results mainly from a reduction in marketable volume (and potentially higher price), revenue loss by domestic producers or distributors, and losses incurred from livestock disease and mortality. In the international market, the impact results from inadmissibility or rejection of products by the international market, and from inability to participate in the international market.

The contribution of market losses to the total economic impact depends on the extent to which the domestic market differentiates aflatoxin-contaminated products. If the domestic market does not differentiate aflatoxin-contaminated products, the market losses from the contamination will be minimal. Among EAC Partner States, in Kenya, the awareness about aflatoxins is high, signaling that domestic market impact will be higher than in other countries.

The EAC Partner States are losing trade and general market accessibility due to sale of aflatoxin contaminated foods. Aflatoxins are barriers to trade, notwithstanding the health implications to the consumer upon sustained consumption of aflatoxin contaminated foods above the tolerable levels. Similarly, livestock such as poultry, pigs, and cattle are also impacted negatively by aflatoxins.

In order to address the impacts of aflatoxin contaminated produce to trade, this policy brief recommends that EAC Partner States provide: adequate human and financial resources to enforce aflatoxin standards in conjunction with Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) measures; put in place an enabling environment to attract informal cross border traders to confidently engage into formal trade systems; a harmonized testing protocol for use by relevant stakeholders along the food value chains; and a credible "aflatoxin safe" certification that will expedite movement of intra-regionally traded aflatoxin prone commodities and products to reduce time spent in border clearance procedures.



Aflatoxin-contaminated groundnut kernels

THE PROBLEM

Trade in Aflatoxin contaminated agricultural produce and products above EAC permissible levels can result into adverse economic losses.

The crops commonly affected by aflatoxins include cereals (maize, sorghum, millet, rice wheat), oil seeds (groundnuts, cottonseed, sesame) root crops (cassava) and nuts (cashews, Brazil nuts, pecans, walnuts, pistachio nuts), and spices (particularly chilies), and products made from these crops. Market losses in trade can be viewed into both domestic and international market losses. In the international market, the impact results from inadmissibility or rejection of products by the international market and from inability to compete in international markets.

In the domestic market, the direct economic impact of aflatoxin contamination in crops results mainly from a reduction in marketable volume (and potentially higher price), revenue loss by domestic producers or distributors, and losses incurred from livestock disease and mortality.

Among the EAC Partner States, awareness about Aflatoxin contamination is high in Kenya, signaling that domestic market impact will be higher than in other Partner States. Nonetheless, there is no stand alone policy on Aflatoxin prevention and control among EAC Partner States, hence calls for a need to develop harmonized approach on prevention and control of aflatoxin along the value chains.

SIZE OF THE PROBLEM

The current EAC harmonized standard for maximum allowable levels of aflatoxin is 10 ppb. However, there are cases of agricultural produce being destroyed because of non-conformity to this standard. For example; in 2014, 13,992 metric tons of aflatoxin contaminated maize was destroyed in Kenya (Figure 1). The consignment could not neither be consumed nor traded due to contamination levels above the tolerable national levels (MoH/MoALF Kenya 2014).

Enforcement of regulations and standards on aflatoxin within the EAC Partner States is inadequate and therefore unable to know the empirical magnitude. However, if the regulations are enforced domestically, the estimated overall loss for the EAC Partner States based on the overall production is high. Kenya and Tanzania each produce large quantities of maize (3.4 and 4.3 million metric tons, respectively). In the highest scenario of maize prevalence, over 2 million metric tons of maize would be lost in each of these countries (FAOSTAT, 2011).

In 2011, maize prices in the EAC Partner States ranged from \$283 to \$406 per metric ton (FAOSTAT). The largest impacts were for Uganda, which had the highest maize exports in 2011, followed by Kenya. Trade values lost in Uganda ranged from \$1.7 million to \$10.3 million. In Kenya, trade values lost ranged from \$656,700 to \$3.9 million. In Tanzania, the trade values lost ranged from \$218,100 to \$1.3 million while in Burundi and Rwanda the trade values lost ranged from \$9,400 to \$56,400 and \$12,700 to \$76,200 respectively (UN Comtrade 2011).

CAUSE OF THE PROBLEM

Inadequate regulatory frameworks, including poor enforcement and coordination mechanisms, and noncompliance to staple food standards are the main causes of the failure to access markets. This may be associated with low level of awareness and poor regulation of domestically traded products. In addition there are multiple actors in enforcing the set regulations. To address these issues, it calls for identification of roles and strategic linkages between the actors. Involvement of the private sector and capacity building of the players along the value chains on Good Agricultural Practices, should be enhanced in order to reduce the volumes of contaminated produce and hence safe food commodities accessing the markets.

POLICY OPTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

POLICY OPTION 1: Provide adequate human and financial resources at national and regional levels to enforce aflatoxin standards in conjunction with Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) measures. There is need for each Partner State to allocate budget lines for aflatoxin prevention and control interventions.

Most failures are resulted from low consideration to provide human and financial resources to enable the translation of policies and commitments into actions.

POLICY OPTION 2: Partner States should invest in sensitization of business operators on the benefits of formal trade system. This will attract informal cross border traders to confidently engage into formal trade systems.

Over half of domestic and cross border trade are conducted informally and is unregulated.

Policy Option 3: Put in place a harmonized testing protocol for use by relevant stakeholders along the food value chains.

There are many actors with different mandates who are involved in regulating foods and food products. These actors use different procedures and processes in determination of the safety of the food and food products. As such the process becomes cumbersome and unstandardized.

Policy Option 4: Develop a credible "aflatoxin safe" certification mechanisms/procedure that will expedite movement of intra-regionally traded aflatoxin prone commodities and products to reduce time spent in transiting borders.

certification and labeling of aflatoxin tested foods as "aflatoxin safe" will assist regulators in facilitation of cross border trade. Further, labeling will enable the consumer to make informed choices.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, H.K., Zablutowicz, R.M., Bruns, H.A., and Abel, C.A. 2006. Biocontrol of aflatoxin in corn by inoculation with non-aflatoxigenic *Aspergillus flavus* isolates. *Biocontrol Science and Technology* 16:5:437-449. Retrieved from <http://afsrweb.usda.gov/SP2UserFiles/Place/64022000/Publications/Zablutowicz/Abbaseta106BST16-437-449.pdf>
- Abt Associates, Inc. 2013. A Conceptual Framework for Conducting Country and Economic Assessment of Aflatoxin Contamination. Prepared for the Meridian Institute, in support of the Partnership for Aflatoxin Control in Africa.
- Diener, U.L., Cole, R.J., Sanders, T.H., Payne, G.A., Lee, L.S., and Klich, M.A. 1987. Epidemiology of aflatoxin formation by *Aspergillus flavus*. *Annual Review of Phytopathology* 25:240–270.
- European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) 2007. Opinion of the Scientific Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain on a request from the Commission related to the potential increase of consumer health risk by a possible increase of the existing maximum levels for aflatoxins in almonds, hazelnuts and pistachios and derived products. *EFSA Journal* 446:1–127.
- FAO/WHO. 2005. Evaluation of certain food contaminants. Sixty-fourth report of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives, Vol. 930. WHO Technical Report Series, Rome.
- Karugia, J., Wanjiku, J., Nzuma, J., Gbegbelegbe, S., Macharia, E., Massawe, S., Freeman, A., Waithaka, M., Kaitibie, S. 2009. The Impact of Non-tariff Barriers on Maize and Beef Trade in East Africa. ReSAKSS (Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System) Working Paper No. 29. Retrieved from <https://cgspace.cgiar.org/bitstream/handle/10568/186/resakss%20working%20paper29.pdf?sequence=1>
- Robert M. Kilonzo, Jasper K. Imungi, William M. Muiru, Peter O. Lamuka & Patrick M. Kamau Njage (2014): Household dietary exposure to aflatoxins from maize and maize products in Kenya, *Food Additives & Contaminants: Part A*, DOI: 10.1080/19440049.2014.976595
- Keyser, J. 2012. Regional Quality Standards for Food Staples in Africa: Harmonization Not Always Appropriate. World Bank, Africa Trade Policy Note No. 33. Retrieved from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTAFRREGTOPTRADE/Resources/PN33_Regional_Standards_FINAL.pdf
- Kurtzman, C.P., Horn B.W., and Hesseltnie, C.W. 1987. *Aspergillus nomius*, a new aflatoxin producing species related to *Aspergillus flavus* and *Aspergillus tamarii*. *Antonie van Leeuwenhoek* 53:147–158.
- Louisiana State University Agriculture Center 2011. Aflatoxin in dairy feeds. Retrieved April 30, 2012, from: http://www.lsuagcenter.com/en/crops_livestock/livestock/dairy/nutrition/Aflatoxin+in+Dairy+Feeds.htm
- Munasib, A., and Roy, D. 2012. Nontariff barriers as bridge to cross. Washington, DC: Aflacontrol Project, IFPRI.
- Ogalo, V. 2010. Informal Cross-Border Trade in EAC: Implications for Regional Integration and Development. CUTS Geneva Resource Centre. Research Paper. Retrieved from http://www.cuts-geneva.org/pdf/BIEAC-RP10-How_Might_EAC_Reduce_Negative_Implications.pdf
- Otsuki, T., Wilson, J.S., and Sewadeh, M. 2001a. What price precaution? European harmonisation of aflatoxin regulations and African groundnuts exports. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 28:3:263–284.
- Otsuki, T., Wilson, J.S., and Sewadeh, M. 2001b. Saving two in a billion: Quantifying the trade effect of European food safety standards on African exports. *Food Policy* 26:5:495–514.
- RASFF (Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed). RASFF Consumers' Portal. Retrieved from <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/rasff-window/portal/>
- Robins, J. and Cardwell, K. 2003. The Costs of Mycotoxin Management to the USA: Management of Aflatoxins in the United States. *Journal of Toxicology: Toxin Reviews*, 22:2 and 3:139–152.
- Strosnider, H., Azziz-Baumgartner, E., Banziger, M., Bhat, R.V., Breiman, R., Brune, M. N., et al. 2006. Workgroup report: public health strategies for reducing aflatoxin exposure in developing countries. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 114:1898–1903.
- Wu, F. 2004. Mycotoxin risk assessment for the purpose of setting international regulatory standards. *Environment Science and Technology* 38:15.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

IITA
Research to Nourish Africa

