



BELIZE TECHNOLOGY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

# BARRIER ANALYSIS AND ENABLING FRAMEWORK

## ADAPTATION

Identification of Barriers and Enabling Framework for Adaptation Technologies in Belize Technology Needs Assessment Climate Change Adaptation

Barrier Analysis and Enabling Framework Report

**National Climate Change Office** 

Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry, the Environment and Sustainable Development

**Market Square** 

**Belmopan**, Belize

This report was prepared for the Government of Belize with funding from the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) with support from the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) in Partnership with the University of Denmark (DTU/UDP).

Copyright © 2018 National Climate Change Office, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry, the Environment and Sustainable Development, Belize and UNEP-DTU.

#### DISCLAIMER

This publication is an output of the Technology Needs Assessment project, funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and implemented by UN Environment (UNEP) and the UNEP DTU Partnership (UDP) in collaboration with the Regional Centeres (Libélula, Peru, and Fondación Bariloche (FB), Argentina). The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of UDP, UN Environment, Libélula or FB. We regret any errors or omissions that may have been unwittingly made. This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part and in any form for educational or non-profit services without special permission from the copyright holder, provided acknowledgement of the source is made. No use of this publication may be made for resale or any other commercial purpose whatsoever without prior permission in writing from the UNEP DTU Partnership.

# BELIZE

# **TECHNOLOGY NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

# Barrier Analysis and Enabling Framework Adaptation Technologies

May 2018

## **Table of Contents**

| List of Figures   |
|---|
| List of Tables7   |
| List of Abbreviations   |
| Glossary of Terms   |
| BARRIER ANALYSIS & ENABLING FRAMEWORK REPORT: ADAPTATION  |
| TECHNOLOGIES16  |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY16   |
| CHAPTER 1. Process for the identification of barriers and measures  |
| 1.1 Objective and Methodology for the Barrier Analysis  |
| 1.2 Category of Prioritized Technologies for the TNA process in Belize  |
| CHAPTER 2. Agriculture sector   |
| 2.1 Preliminary targets for technology transfer and diffusion in Agriculture  |
| 2.2 Barrier analysis and possible enabling measures for heat and drought resistant varieties of open-pollinating corn and beans seeds                                     |
| 2.3 Barrier analysis and possible enabling measures for improved drip irrigation / fertigation systems  |
| 2.4 Barrier analysis and possible enabling measures for crop covered structure cooling systems  |
| 2.4.1.1 Preliminary targets for technology transfer and diffusion   |
| 2.5 Barrier analysis and possible enabling measures for in-country Irish potato clean-<br>stock production unit to produce quality seed-tuber planting material varieties |
| 2.6 Linkages of the barriers identified114  |
| 2.7 Enabling framework for overcoming the barriers in the Agriculture Sector116   |
| CHAPTER 3. Coastal and marine ecosystem sector  |
| 3.1 Preliminary targets for technology transfer and diffusion   |
| 3.2 Barrier analysis and possible enabling measures for Belize's Coastal Zone monitoring network and Early Warning System   |
| 3.3 Linkages of the barriers identified147  |
| 3.4 Enabling framework for overcoming the barriers in the Coastal and Marine Ecosystem Sector   |
| CHAPTER 4. Water sector   |
| 4.1 Preliminary targets for technology transfer and diffusion   |

| 4.2 Barrier analysis and possible enabling measures for integrated management strategy for water safety in eight Rural Water Supply Systems |
|---|
| 4.3 Linkages of the barriers identified170  |
| 4.4 Enabling framework for overcoming the barriers in the Water Sector171   |
| CHAPTER 5. Conclusions174   |
| LIST OF REFERENCES  |
| ANNEX A1-1: Categorization of prioritized adaptation technologies for the TNA process in Belize   |
| ANNEX I-B: Grain and Potato Production Statistics, 2010 – 1016  |
| ANNEX I-C: Cost-Benefit Review for Agriculture Sector Technologies  |
| ANNEX I-D: Model Output to Assess Impacts of some Measures for Diffusion of Technologies  |
| ANNEX II: Economic Evaluation and Renewable Energy Input for Different Agriculture<br>Adaptation Technologies                               |
| ANNEX III: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED AND THEIR CONTACTS207  |
| ANNEX IV: Gross Domestic Product by Activity  |
| ANNEX V: List of Tax Exempted Goods   |
| ANNEX VI: National Agriculture and Food Policy 2015-2920213   |
| ANNEX VII: Weekly Average Retail Price BZ\$ for Agriculture Commodities216  |
| ANNEX VIII: List of Priority Commodities  |
| ANNEX IX: Strategic Management and Planning. Ministry of Agriculture, July 2017218  |
| ANNEX X: Key Supporting Departments and Agencies in the Coastal Zone and Marine Sector  |

## **List of Figures**

| Figure 1: Problem tree for low cultivation of climate resilient grains among small farmers 53 |
|---|
| Figure 2: Size of economic barrier for climate resilient variety of yellow corn               |
| Figure 3: Size of economic barrier for new varieties of Black and Small Red beans             |
| Figure 4: Decomposition of key barriers to the diffusion of technologies in Agriculture58     |
| Figure 5: Objective tree for cultivation of climate resilient grains among small farm59       |
| Figure 6: CBA model results plots for measures related to Yellow Corn seed production63       |
| Figure 7: Problem tree for "not-widely use of drip irrigation/fertigation among small         |
| farmers."   |
| Figure 8: Operating cash flow for proposed Drip Irrigation system                             |
| Figure 9: Objective tree for improved drip irrigation/fertigation use among small farmers.80  |
| Figure 10: Problem tree for over-heated crop cover structure/tropical greenhouse              |
| Figure 11: Objective tree for the redesigned of cooler crop protective covered structure or   |
| tropical greenhouse   |
| Figure 12: Process for the production of certified tuber-seed for quality potato harvest102   |
| Figure 13 : Problem Tree for imported none-climate resilient potato seeds107                  |
| Figure 14: Objective Tree for in-country micro-propagated climate resilient potato seeds 110  |
| Figure 15: Problem tree for increasing threat to coastal and marine resources and use140      |
| Figure 16: Solution tree for, 'Early Warning contributes to decreased threat to coastal and   |
| marine resources and use'   |
| Figure 17: Steps in the development of a WSP (Adapted from Davison et al., 2005)156           |
| Figure 18: Problem Tree for limited institutional capacity/management of Rural Water          |
| Boards164   |
| Figure 19: Solution/Objective Tree for improved management of Rural Water Boards167           |

## List of Tables

| Table 1: Categorization of Key Stakeholder Agencies in the Agriculture Sector  |
|--|
| Table 2: Categorization of Key Stakeholder Agencies in the Marine and Coastal Zone   |
| Sector   |
| Table 3: Categorization of Key Stakeholder Agencies in the Water Sector  |
| Table 4: Categorisation and Prioritisation Process for Barriers    29  |
| Table 5: Category of prioritized technologies    31  |
| Table 6: Sample of technologies and related barriers for Market Goods       32   |
| Table 7: Targets and possibility of attainment of agriculture technology diffusion   |
| Table 8: Strategic matrix for corn and beans production    41  |
| Table 9: Recent average yields in grain and potato production  |
| Table 10: Criteria and importance of barriers for climate resilient grains   |
| Table 11: Cost-Benefit Analysis for cultivation of one hectare of yellow corn and beans57  |
| Table 12: Proposed strategic pathway for objective - 'Extensive use of climate resilien  |
| crops/grains among small farmers'  |
| Table 13: Cost-benefit results to assess measures for diffusion of climate   |
| Table 14: Assessing sets of measures for improved corn seed production   |
| Table 15: Summary of market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures fo  |
| improved varieties of grain seeds  |
| Table 16: Percent applied irrigation per productive system in Belize in 2011   |
| Table 17: Criteria and Importance of Barriers for improved drip irrigation and   |
| fertigation72  |
| Table 18: Selected list of key barriers to the diffusion of improved drip irrigation74   |
| Table 19: Investment cost for six only improved drip irrigation systems    78  |
| Table 20: Proposed strategic pathway for objective: 'Drip Irrigation widely used by small  |
| farmers'   |
|  |
| Table 21: Summary of market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures fo  |
| Table 21: Summary of market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures fo      improved drip irrigation/fertigation system   |
| Table 21: Summary of market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures foimproved drip irrigation/fertigation system   |
| Table 21: Summary of market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures foimproved drip irrigation/fertigation system.83Table 22: Targets and possibility of attainment of technology transfer for improvedcooling systems for tropical greenhouses, Bubble Houses and/or BEL Houses88  |
| Table 21: Summary of market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures foimproved drip irrigation/fertigation systemTable 22: Targets and possibility of attainment of technology transfer for improvedcooling systems for tropical greenhouses, Bubble Houses and/or BEL Houses88Table 23: Criteria and Importance of Barriers for the diffusion of PCS cooling systems   |
| Table 21: Summary of market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures foimproved drip irrigation/fertigation system.83Table 22: Targets and possibility of attainment of technology transfer for improvedcooling systems for tropical greenhouses, Bubble Houses and/or BEL Houses88Table 23: Criteria and Importance of Barriers for the diffusion of PCS cooling systems  |
| Table 21: Summary of market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures fo         improved drip irrigation/fertigation system.       83         Table 22: Targets and possibility of attainment of technology transfer for improved       88         Cooling systems for tropical greenhouses, Bubble Houses and/or BEL Houses       88         Table 23: Criteria and Importance of Barriers for the diffusion of PCS cooling systems |
| Table 21: Summary of market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures fo         improved drip irrigation/fertigation system.       83         Table 22: Targets and possibility of attainment of technology transfer for improved       83         Cooling systems for tropical greenhouses, Bubble Houses and/or BEL Houses       88         Table 23: Criteria and Importance of Barriers for the diffusion of PCS cooling systems |
| Table 21: Summary of market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures fo         improved drip irrigation/fertigation system.       83         Table 22: Targets and possibility of attainment of technology transfer for improved       83         cooling systems for tropical greenhouses, Bubble Houses and/or BEL Houses       88         Table 23: Criteria and Importance of Barriers for the diffusion of PCS cooling systems |
| Table 21: Summary of market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures fo         improved drip irrigation/fertigation system.       83         Table 22: Targets and possibility of attainment of technology transfer for improved       83         Cooling systems for tropical greenhouses, Bubble Houses and/or BEL Houses       88         Table 23: Criteria and Importance of Barriers for the diffusion of PCS cooling systems |
| Table 21: Summary of market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures fo         improved drip irrigation/fertigation system.       83         Table 22: Targets and possibility of attainment of technology transfer for improved       88         Table 23: Criteria and Importance of Barriers for the diffusion of PCS cooling systems  |

Table 28: Criteria and Importance of Barriers for improved drip irrigation and fertigation Table 29: Selection of killer or non-starter barriers to the diffusion of micro-propagation of Table 30: Proposed strategic pathway for objective, 'Climate resilient varieties of Irish Table 31: Summary of barriers and corresponding measures for micro-propagated production of clean, climate resilient Irish potato seed-tubers......113 Table 33: Enabling framework for overcoming barriers for technology transfer in the Table 35: Criteria and Importance of barriers impeding the transfer of technology for a Table 36: Selection of killer or non-starter barriers for technology transfer of a marine Table 37: Proposed strategic pathway for objective: 'Early Warning Contributes to Table 38: Market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures related to the transfer of the marine monitoring network and Early Warning ......145 Table 39: Linkages of economic and non-economic barriers identified for the proposed Table 40: Linkages of identified barriers with components of proposed marine 

 Table 41: Enabling framework for proposed marine early warning system

 152

 Table 42: Summary of the WSP technology targets for the water sector and benefits versus Table 43: Criteria and Importance of Barriers for the diffusion of an Integrated Management Table 44: Selection of killer or non-starter barriers to the diffusion of an Integrated Management Strategy for threatened Rudimentary Water Systems (RWS) ......162 Table 45: Proposed strategic pathway for objective, 'Improved Institutional Capacity of Table 46: Summary of barriers and corresponding measures for instituting an Integrated Table 47: Linkages of Barriers identified for Limited Institutional Capacity of Village Water Boards ......171 Table 48: Enabling framework for facilitating technology transfer for improved management of threatened RWS.....172

## List of Abbreviations

| ASR     | American Sugar Refineries  |
|---------|--|
| BAHA    | Belize Agricultural Health Authority                                   |
| BNCCC   | Belize National Climate Change Committee                               |
| BSI     | Belize Sugar Industry  |
| CARDI   | Caribbean Agriculture Research and Development Institute               |
| CCD     | Climate Change Department  |
| CGIAR   | Consultative Group for International Agriculture Research              |
| CIAT    | International Centre for Tropical Agriculture                          |
| CIMMYT  | International Maize and Wheat Improvement Centre                       |
| CNG     | Compressed Natural Gas   |
| COP     | Conference of the Parties  |
| CRDU    | Crop Research and Development Unit                                     |
| CTI     | Climate Technology Initiative  |
| CZMAI   | Coastal Zone Management Authority and Institute                        |
| DRR     | Disaster Risk Reduction  |
| DTU     | Technical University of Denmark  |
| EST     | Environmentally Sound Technology                                       |
| EU-GCCA | European Union- Global Climate Change Alliance                         |
| FCDU    | Fruit-tree and Crop Development Unit                                   |
| GCF     | Green Climate Fund   |
| GEF     | Global Environment Facility  |
| Gg      | Giga gram  |
| GCM     | Global Climate Models  |
| GDP     | Gross Domestic Product   |
| GHG     | Green House Gas  |
| GPRS    | Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy                                  |
| GSDS    | Growth and Sustainable Development Strategy                            |
| ICT     | Information and Communication Technology                               |
| IICA    | Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture                |
| IPCC    | Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change                             |
| IPR     | Intellectual Property Rights   |
| KAP     | Knowledge, Attitude and Perception                                     |
| KBA     | Key Biodiversity Areas   |
| LCDS    | Low Carbon Development Strategy  |
| LDC     | Least Developed Country  |
| LFA     | Logical Framework Analysis   |
| LULUCF  | Land Use, Landuse Change and Forestry                                  |
| MAFFESD | Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, Environment, Sustainable |
|         | Development, Climate Change & Immigration                              |
| MCDA    | Multi Criteria Decision Analysis                                       |
| MDG     | Millennium Development Goals   |
| MESTPU  | Ministry of Energy, Science and Technology, and Public Utilities       |
| MLLGRD  | Ministry of Labour, Local Government and Rural Development             |
| MNR     | Ministry of Natural Resources  |

| MOA     | Ministry of Agriculture                                   |
|---------|---|
| MOH     | Ministry of Health  |
| MRV     | Monitoring, Reporting, and Verification                   |
| NAMA    | Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action                  |
| NAPA    | National Adaptation Programme of Action                   |
| NAVCO   | National Association of Village Councils                  |
| NC      | National Communication                                    |
| NCCC    | National Climate Change Committee                         |
| NCCO    | National Climate Change Office                            |
| NCCPSAP | National Climate Change Policy, Strategy, and Action Plan |
| NDC     | Nationally Determine Contribution                         |
| NEPF    | National Energy Policy Framework                          |
| NMVOC   | Non-Methane Volatile Organic Compound                     |
| NPSC    | National Project Steering Committee                       |
| NSDS    | National Sustainable Development Strategy                 |
| NSTMP   | National Sustainable Tourism Master Plan                  |
| O&M     | Operation and Maintenance                                 |
| PAHO    | Pan American Health Organization                          |
| PMCA    | Participatory Market Chain Approach                       |
| PV      | Solar Photovoltaic System (Generating Electricity)        |
| RCM     | Regional Climate Model                                    |
| RE      | Renewable Energy  |
| REDD    | Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation     |
| RWS     | Rudimentary Water System                                  |
| SBSTA   | Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice   |
| SDG     | Sustainable Development Goal                              |
| SME     | Small Medium-sized Enterprises                            |
| SNC     | Second National Communication                             |
| SPS     | Supply, Packaging and Storage                             |
| SPS     | Sanitary and phytosanitary                                |
| STWG    | Sector-based Technology Working Groups                    |
| TAP     | Technology Action Plan                                    |
| TNA     | Technology Needs Assessment                               |
| TNC     | Third National Communication                              |
| TTD     | Technology Transfer and Diffusion                         |
| UB      | University of Belize School of Agriculture                |
| UNDP    | United Nations Development Programme                      |
| UNEP    | United Nations Environment Programme                      |
| UNFCCC  | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change     |
| WB      | World Bank  |
| WHO     | World Health Organization                                 |
| WSP     | Water Safety Plan   |
| WTO     | World Trade Organization                                  |

#### **Glossary of Terms**

#### Adaptation

Adaptation is a short for 'climate change adaptation', adjustment in natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climate stimuli or their effects, which moderate harm or exploit beneficial opportunities (IPCC, 2007). Adaptation is a process, not an outcome.

#### Afforestation

Direct human-induced conversion of land that has been forested for a period of at least 50 years to forested land through planting, seeding and/or the human-induced promotion of natural seed sources.

#### **Ancillary benefits**

Policies aimed at some target, e.g. climate change mitigation, may be paired with positive side effects, such as increased resource-use efficiency, reduced emissions of air pollutants associated with fossil fuel use, improved transportation, agriculture, land use practices, employment, and fuel security. **Ancillary impacts** are also used when the effects may be negative. Policies directed at abating air pollution may consider greenhouse-gas mitigation an ancillary benefit.

#### Barrier

Obstruction or impediment that impedes technology transfer; a reason why a target is adversely affected, including any failed or missing countermeasures that could or should have prevented the undesired effect(s).

#### Biofuel

Any liquid, gaseous, or solid fuel produced from plant or animal organic matter. E.g. soybean oil, alcohol from fermented sugar, black liquor from paper manufacturing process, wood as fuel, etc.

#### **Biomass**

The total mass of living organism in a given area or of a given species usually expressed as dry weight. Organic matter consisting of, or recently derived from, living organisms (especially regarded as fuel) excluding peat. Biomass includes products, by-products and waste derived from such material. **Cellulosic biomass** is biomass from cellulose, primary structural component of plants and trees.

#### **Capital goods**

Machinery and equipment used in the production of other goods, e.g. consumer goods such as boilers, motors, steel or pumps. May also mean 'producer goods'.

#### Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)

 $CO_2$  is a naturally occurring greenhouse gas, and a by-product of burning fossil fuels or biomass, of land-use changes and of industrial processes. It is the principal anthropogenic greenhouse gas that affects Earth's radiative balance. It is the reference gas against which other greenhouse gases are measured and therefore it has a Global Warming Potential of 1.

#### **Climate Change (CC)**

Climate change refers to a change in the state of the climate that can be identified (e.g., by using statistical tests) by changes in the mean and /or variability of its properties, and that persist for an extended period, typically decades or longer. Climate change may be due to natural internal processes or external forcing, or to persistent anthropogenic changes in the composition of the atmosphere or in land use.

#### **Carbon price**

What has to be paid (to some public authority as a tax rate, or on some emission permit exchange) for the emission of 1 ton of  $CO_2$  into the atmosphere.

#### **Coastal Zone**

The coastal zone encompasses the full extent of the area ranging from the open sea to the beaches and into the watersheds, and diverse flora and fauna that thrives in these systems, including *Homo sapiens*. The coastal zone comprises a many of species, ecosystems, user groups, and economic, social and cultural interests.

#### **Consumer goods**

Good and products specifically intended for the mass market and purchased by (private) consumers.

#### **Cost-benefit analysis**

Monetary measurement of all negative and positive impacts associated with a given action. Costs and benefits are compared in terms of their difference and/or ratio as an indicator of how a given investment or other policy effort pays off seen from the society's point of view.

#### Diffusion

The process by which a technology is spread or disseminated through various channels over time in a society, where the technology is gradually adopted by more and more members of the society (people, institutions, companies, etc.).

#### **Enabling Environment/Framework**

The set of resources and conditions within which the technology and the target beneficiaries operate. The resources and conditions that are generated by structures and institutions that are beyond the immediate control of the beneficiaries should support and improve the quality and efficiency of the transfer and diffusion of technologies.

#### Energy

The amount of work or heat delivered. Energy is classified in a variety of types and becomes useful to human ends when it flows from one place to another or is converted from one type to another.

#### Fertigation

The application of fertilizers, soil amendments or other water-soluble products/inputs through an irrigation system.

#### **Global Warming**

Global warming refers to the gradual increase, observed or projected, in global surface temperature, as one of the consequences of radiative forcing caused by anthropogenic warming. Global warming refers to the global increase, observed or projected, in global average surface temperature, as one of the consequences of radiative forcing caused by anthropogenic emissions.

#### **Greenhouse effect**

Greenhouse gases effectively absorb infrared radiation, emitted from the Earth's surface, by the atmosphere itself due to the same gases and by clouds. Atmospheric radiation is emitted to all sides, including downward to the Earth's surface. Thus, greenhouse gases trap heat within the surface-troposphere system. This is called the greenhouse effect.

#### Hardware

The tangible aspects of technology, such as equipment and machinery.

#### Innovation

Innovation refers to both the processes of research and development and the commercialization of the technology, including its social acceptance and adoption.

#### Land-use

The total of arrangements, activities and inputs undertaken in a certain land-cover type (a set of human actions). The social and economic purposes for which land is managed (e.g., grazing, timber extraction, and conservation). Land-use change occurs when, e.g., forest is converted to agricultural land or to urban areas.

#### Low-carbon technology

A technology that over its life cycle causes less CO<sub>2</sub>-eq. emissions than other technological options do.

#### Market/value chain

The chain of economic actors that own and transact a particular product as it moves from primary producer to final consumer.

#### Market mapping

An analytical framework for understanding market systems and an approach to market development that is both systematic and participatory.

#### Measures

Measures are technologies, processes, and practices that reduce GHG emissions or effects below anticipated future levels. Examples of measures are renewable energy technologies, waste minimization processes and public transport commuting practices etc. Measures can also be factors (financial or non-financial) that enable or motivate a particular course of action or behavioural change or is a reason for preferring one choice over the alternate. Often the word 'incentive' is used synonymously, sometime with a slightly different interpretation.

#### Milpa system

A form of subsistent farming; slash-and-burn or shifting cultivation. Swidden agriculture.

#### Mitigation

Mitigation is short for 'climate change mitigation', meaning an action to decrease the concentration of greenhouse gasses, either by reducing their sources or by increasing their sinks.

#### **National Action Plans**

Plans submitted to the COP by parties outlining the steps that they have adopted to limit their anthropogenic GHG emissions. Countries must submit these plans as a condition of participating in the UNFCCC and, subsequently, must communicate their progress to the COP regularly. The National Action Plans form part of the National Communications, which include the national inventory of GHG sources and sinks.

#### Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)

One of the six types of greenhouse gases to be curbed under the Kyoto Protocol.

#### Non-market goods

Goods not traded in a market.

#### Orgware

The institutional framework, or organizational aspects, involved in the diffusion and uptake of a technology.

#### **Praedial larceny**

The theft of agriculture produces. Is widely acknowledged in the Caribbean region as a practice that is negatively impacting the development of the agriculture sector. Illegal fishing or piracy in the Exclusive Economic Zones of respective member states is also considered praedial larceny.

**Primary energy** or **energy sources** is the energy embodied in natural resources (e.g. coal, crude oil, natural gas, uranium) that has not undergone any anthropogenic conversion. Primary energy is transformed into **secondary energy** by cleaning (natural gas), refining (oil into oil products) or by conversion into electricity or heat. **Final energy** is secondary energy delivered at the end-use facilities (e.g., electricity at the wall outlet), where it becomes **usable energy** (e.g., light).

#### **Publicly provided goods**

A category of technologies characterized by large investments, general public ownership, and production of good and services available for the public or a large group of persons.

#### Reforestation

Direct human-induced conversion of non-forested land to forested land through planting, seeding and/or the human-induced promotion of natural seed sources, on land that was previously forested but converted to non-forested land.

#### **Renewable Energy**

Renewable energy is energy that is collected from renewable resources, which are naturally replenished on a human timescale, such as sunlight, biomass, wind, rain, tides, waves and geothermal heat.

#### Sequestration

Carbon storage in terrestrial or marine reservoirs. Biological sequestration includes direct removal of  $CO_2$  from the atmosphere through land-use change, afforestation, carbon storage in landfills and practices that enhance soil carbon storage in agriculture.

#### Sinks

Any process, activity or mechanism that removes a greenhouse gas or aerosol, or a precursor of a greenhouse gas or aerosol from the atmosphere.

#### Stakeholder

A person, group, organization or system that affects or can be affected by an actor's actions.

#### Technology

Technology is a piece of equipment, technique, practical knowledge or skills for performing a particular activity. It is common to distinguish between three different elements of technology: the tangible aspect such as equipment and products (hardware); the know-how, experience and practices (software) associated with the production and use of the hardware; and the institutional framework, or organization, involved in the transfer and diffusion of a new piece of equipment or product (orgware).

#### **Technology transfer**

Technology transfer involves vertical technology transfer, which is understood as the movement of technologies from the R&D stage to the commercialization, and horizontal transfer, which involves the spatial relocation or diffusion of technologies across space.

#### Vulnerability

Vulnerability is the degree to which a system is susceptible to, and unable to cope with, adverse effects of climate change, including climate variability and extremes. Vulnerability is a function of the character, magnitude, and rate of climate change and variation to which a system is exposed, its sensitivity and adaptive capacity.

## **BARRIER ANALYSIS & ENABLING FRAMEWORK REPORT: ADAPTATION TECHNOLOGIES**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Achieving successful technology transfer requires participation and building on indigenous knowledge. While hardware has taken centre stage in activities and interventions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, processes and institutions are central to building capacity and resilience to the impacts of climate change.

Article 4.5 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change states: "The successful deployment and transfer of environmentally sound technologies and know how requires a country-driven, integrated approach at a national and sectoral level. This should involve co-operation among various stakeholders (the private sector, governments, the donor community, bi-lateral and multi-lateral institutions, non-governmental organizations, academic and research institutions), including activities on technological needs assessments, technology information, enabling environments, capacity building and mechanisms for technology transfer" (Tempo #67, 2008).

This report reviews the main barriers to the diffusion of six prioritized adaptation technologies for the Technology Needs Assessment Phase II process in Belize (Nygaard and Hansen, 2015), and identifies the enabling framework and 'measures' to help facilitate the smooth transfer of the proposed technologies. The latter covers the institutional and legal status in each sector that can help to promote the proposed technologies.

The vulnerable sectors selected by key stakeholders through a participatory, consultative process were: Agriculture Sector, Coastal and Marine Ecosystems, and the Water Sector.

The prioritized technologies for the Agriculture sector include:

- Heat and Drought resistant variety of open-pollinating corn and beans seeds for reproduction and marketing for four farmers' cooperatives;
- Improved drip irrigation systems for five farming groups using rainwater harvesting and fertigation for crop nutrient requirement;
- Establish an in-country Irish potato clean-stock production unit to produce quality seed-tuber planting material varieties; and
- *Rehabilitation of Seven Covered Structure Cooling Systems.*

For the Coastal and Marine Ecosystems sector, the prioritized technology is:

• Improved Environmental Monitoring Network and Early Warning System for Belize's Coastal Zone to Increase Resilience to Climate Change;

and for the Water sector, it is:

• An Integrated Management Strategy for Water Safety for Eight Rural Water Supply Systems in Belize.

#### Agriculture

Although the National Food and Agriculture Policy 2002-2020 is still the official guiding policy for Agriculture in Belize, the yet-to-be adopted National Agriculture and Food Policy 2015-2030 (GOB/MOA/FAO, 2015) is referred to for matters that address more-in-depth the challenges related to global warming and climate change, disaster risk reduction issues, and sustainable agriculture not adequately covered in the first policy.

Since there has not been an updated "Agriculture Development, Management and Operational Strategy 2003A" (ADMOS) (GOB/MOA/FAO, 2003), some components of ADMOS 2003 are still being used. Recently, the Department drafted a strategy matrix for program coordination for grain and potato crops, respectively. An update of the ADMOS is still a work in progress in the Ministry of Agriculture (R. Thompson, Project Coordinator, MOA; Personal comm. August, 2017).

The general focus of the MOA is captured in the National Food and Agriculture Policy 2015-2030 which states " ... engender a conducive environment for the development of an Agriculture and Food Sector that is competitive, diversified and sustainable, enhances food security and nutrition, and contributes to the achievement of the socio-economic development goals of Belize."

The Agriculture Sector has a focus on a value chain approach to production with emphasis on productivity and competitiveness, in order to penetrate export markets and meet the basic food security needs of the country. Small-scale farmers in developing countries still largely rely on the public sector for technology transfer, especially if they cultivate crops that do not interest private firms (Piñero, 2007).

Some of the critical or non-starter (killer) barriers tabled and discussed among senior personnel of the Ministry of Agriculture, other stakeholders, and members of the Sectorbased Technology Working Groups (STWG), that may impede the smooth transfer and diffusion of the four prioritized technologies for the Agriculture Sector under the TNA initiatives were considered under the following classification: Economic and financial, and Non-financial.

• *Economic and Financial.* High upfront or capital costs of technology equipment, spares, and ancillary components, is a killer or non-starter barrier which may easily

discourage potential investors and other stakeholders/farmers, investing in a new or improved technology. High operational and maintenance costs were also categorized as critical barriers to the diffusion of any technology, if other factors such as increased yields and favourable markets are not realized in favour of small and medium-scale producers.

Non-financial.

- *Enabling policy environment*: Investment in new technologies and technology transfer and diffusion, requires conducive and favourable policy environment for successfully streamlining the technology and its socioeconomic benefits within the developmental framework of a country and society. Subsidies and tariff reduction (lower import duties and taxes, zero-rated import category, etc) should be considered on certain equipment and components that form an integral part of the technology transfer and diffusion process, at least for the start-up phase. Market policies (import/export and restrictions, etc.), correspondence banking, rate of exchange, interest rates, and general investment climate (investment risks, credit lines, transparency, political stability, etc.) are key factors that can impede the transfer of technology.
- *Technical capacity*: A critical barrier to cost-effective transfer and diffusion of technology in the Agriculture and related sectors is the limited technical capacity that exist to operate and efficiently maintain new and improved technologies. It is often stated that it is the lack of funds for maintenance that results in the technology ending in disrepair. The barrier may be a combination of both inadequate funds and the limited technical capacity and innovation skills that prevail. Nevertheless, networking with partners and experts in the Private sector and industry, and specialized training programmes in innovative technology, are measures that can help to build capacity and strengthen institutions in the Public sector such as Agriculture.
- Level of technical and organizational capacity of farmers: A significant proportion of small and medium-scale farmers have limited technical capacity and skills in technology operation. Language and literacy level are barriers that may affect their uptake of new information and skill development.
- *Incumbent technology:* The incumbent technology can be a major hurdle to the transfer and diffusion of cost-effective and beneficial, improved technology. Farmers and other stakeholders may be comfortable with the incumbent and not interested in upgrading; the incumbent may be part of a monopoly, often controlled by self interest parties in places of authority; users may simply be satisfied with the incumbent and cannot affore investing in a new technology. There may be other reasons that should be examined and addressed.
- *Information Barriers:* Reliable information exists on technologies being considered for transfer and diffusion. However, information barriers arise when the information is not disseminated correctly and hence, does not reach potential users or clients. Additionally, should the information reach potential users, the mis-interpretation and misuse of technical information becomes a barrier, if technology awareness and education is not conducted to guide users, such as farmers and producers.

The IPPC (2000) indicated that the 'enabling environment' or 'enabling framework' for facilitating the transfer of climate change technology is the entire range of institutional, regulatory and political conditions that are conducive to promote and facilitate the transfer and diffusion of technologies (Nygaard and Hansen, 2015).

The Ministry of Agriculture partners with several local, regional and international institutions to promote sustainable agriculture in Belize. The agriculture sector policy and institutional framework guides the climate change adaptation strategy, and will determine decisions to be made, and the most suitable entities to implement the proposed TNA prioritized adaptation technologies for the sector.

Specific actions or critical measures identified during the barrier analysis included, but not limited to the following:

- Expand access to local and external finance.
- Lobby for reduced import Tax on equipment and seeds.
- Provide technology companies & suppliers with concession to service specific areas or groups of clients at reduced service costs (Public-private partnership).
- Set up local assembling industry where feasible.
- Improve access to products and services. Grow the market for new technology.
- Implement policies & regulations for lucrative markets.
- Improve policy and enabling environment (e.g. seed policy, market liberalisation, protectionism, monopoly of incumbent technology).
- Establish regulatory agency for standards, testing and certification (equipment, seeds, etc.).
- Strengthen regulatory framework (e.g. implementation & penalty)
- Enhance networking for certified seed production/ improved drip irrigation / potato cultivation chain actors.
- Strengthen research, development and demonstration of new technology.
- Strengthen Cooperative Dep. and form an association of farmer's cooperatives.
- Establish a programme to increase local and regional farmer's networking, utilizin mass media and ICT.
- Establish management programme and education/awareness campaign among key stakeholders for new technology.
- Establish training component in technology diffusion programme

#### Coastal and Marine ecosystems and environment

Analysis of prominent barriers to technology transfer and diffusion in the Coastal and Marine Ecosystem sector for an environmental monitoring network and early warning system, are presented in the Report. The following is a summary of non-starter and critical barriers in key component of the technology transfer process:

• *Economic and financial* High capital costs for marine environmental monitoring equipment and spares is a critical barrier that may easily discourage potential investors. High operational and maintenance costs were also identified as critical barriers to the diffusion of any technology, especially a modern environmental monitoring network of marine station/platforms comprising of sensitive instruments that requires continuous maintenance and replacement of components (e.g. cable, sensors, batteries/solar energy panels, communication spares etc.).

#### Non-financial

- Organisational/regulatory: Many organization operate in the Coastal Zone but some work in isolation. Coordination and synergy among some key stakeholders is lacking. Fisheries regulations are in place and are arduously being implemented, but there are those stakeholders that maintain that measures are too restrictive and affect their livelihood. Hence non-cooperating stakeholders can restrict the optimization of an efficient, marine monitoring network and early warning, that is for the benefit of all stakeholders operating in the Coastal Zone.
- Weak Enabling policy environments for establishment of adequate Marine Environmental Monitoring Network: Currently, marine environmental monitoring is being done for water quality and other physical impacts along the coastline and the barrier reef. However, the data collection covers only small sections of the marine environment and historical data is fragmented or periodic, and kev indicators/parameters are missing. The Coastal Zone Development and Management Plan makes provision for comprehensive marine environmental monitoring, but capacity, professional human resources, and financing are major barriers for an improved and extended marine environmental monitoring network.
- *Incumbent technology:* Investments in marine environmental monitoring platforms and network have been carried out in the past through many projects and scientific research programme. However, sustainability has proven to be a major problem as funding dries up and plans to maintain the monitoring network fall apart for lack of finance, decreased institutional capacity and phasing out of old technology by new, improved and faster systems. This can be a major hurdle in the establishment of a modern, high technology marine monitoring network for the long haul, and workable measures must be implemented for sustainability and safeguarding the capital investment.
- *Information barrier:* Information on the most reliable, high precision, durable and affordable marine monitoring platforms or sensors is available. In formation on

environmental monitoring systems is not a barrier per se; however, the use and its interpretation can be a barrier by the inexperience technicians, clients or environmental officers.

• *Technical barriers*: Operation and maintenance of an efficient marine environmental monitoring network requires technically skilled technicians. Most of these skilled persons are in the private sector, but many are available in the public sector. Capacity in the Fisheries and CZMAI is limited, but personnel can be trained to operate the marine monitoring network.

Some actions or measures identified in the analysis for the Coastal and Marine Ecosystem technology transfer included, but not limited to the following:

- Fisheries Department in coordination with partners will continue strengthening the technical capacity of its personnel, thereby increasing the number of specialized expertise/trained staff;
- Through its regulatory mandate, Fisheries & CZMAI will continue work on implementation of legislative/regulatory framework;
- Fisheries Department, in coordination with partners will maintain public campaigns, awareness drives and advocacy for high priority given to marine ecosystem conservation by GOB & stakeholders;
- Fisheries will operationalize a coordinated and effective marine monitoring network and early warning;
- Fisheries and CZMAI will strengthen human and institutional capacity to write bankable project proposals and continue to identify potential international funding opportunities.

#### Water Sector

Provision of safe and wholesome water for domestic use is a human right and is vitally important for the health and well being of the rural population in Belize. The disruption of Rudimentary Water System (RWS) services in some villages is the result not of water availability, but the poor governance of the service, which includes the monitoring and technical operation/maintenance of the system, including the water treatment process and protection of the water source. This prioritized technology for the water Sector is to establish: *An Integrated Management Strategy for Water Safety for Eight Rural Water Supply Systems in Belize.* The essence of the technology transfer for threatened RWSs is the implementation of Water Safety Plans as recommended by WHO, comprising of: System Assessment and Operation; Monitoring; and Management and Communication.

The critical barriers that hinder the transfer of this technology are analysed in the Report, but a brief summary of the prevailing issues per key components of the technology transfer process is the following:

#### Economic and financial

• Financial management in the operation of Rudimentary Water Systems (RWS) is key for a successful water delivery service and its sustainability. Weak or none-cost recovery and service fee collection imperils successful operation of RWS in many communities. The high cost of spares such as water pumps, pvc pipes, fittings, meters, chemicals, etc., and general maintenance costs are also barrier for implementation of water safety plans for the successful operation of RWS.

#### Non-financial

- Organisational/regulatory: Members of Village Water Boards are politically assigned or nominated. Many of the political appointees do not have the capacity or commitment to do the job. The Village Council Act that governs the Village Water Boards must be reviewed, and amendments made to address this issue.
- Weak Enabling policy environments for establishment of adequate Marine Environmental Monitoring Network: Stakeholders in the water sector and community members contacted during the consultative process indicated that the policy regarding Village Water Board needs to be revised so that qualified personnel committed to the work can be hired or contracted. Thus, advocacy in this regard should be increased at the community and decision-making levels
- *Incumbent technology:* The incumbent technology is the absence of a Rudimentary Water System (RWS) for rural communities. RWS have worked in many parts of the world including Belize. Investments in this technology for delivery of safe water supply to rural communities will continue. The technology is becoming automated, including the water purification component. Solar PV technology is also being introduced to run the water pumps. However, the main problem is governance of these system. The technology transfer for threatened RWSs is the implementation of Water Safety Plans as recommended by WHO, comprising of: System Assessment and Operation; Monitoring; Management and Communication.
- *Information barrier:* Relevant information on components of RWS is lodged in the offices of the Rural Development Department in the Ministry of Labour, Local Government and Rural Development, in the Public Health Bureau, and at the Social Investment Fund (SIF). Technical and managerial capacity to run the daily operations of a RWS successfully is the critical barrier identified by stakeholders. Most members of Village Water Boards have no technical or managerial skills.
- *Technical barriers*: Committed and skilled persons are required to operate, manage and maintain RWS in accordance with an adopted Water Safety Plan. The technology transfer for the *Management and Operation for Water Safety of eight Rural Water Supply Systems* will include measures to overcome the technical deficiency for a sustainable and safe water delivery systems for the target communities

Measures identified with stakeholders' input in the Water sector included:

- Public Health Bureau develops and implement a timely, water-quality monitoring protocol for target Rudimentary Water Systems. This can be executed as part of the technology transfer for RWS Water Safety Plans. The budget for this activity will form part of the capital costs.
- Public Health Bureau and Rural Water Department spearhead the efforts to procure capital finance for the *Management and Operation for Water Safety of eight Rural Water Supply Systems*.
- Capital cost will include training for Village Water Boards in Business-oriented RWS operation and management
- Village Water Boards in coordination with Rural Water Department will procure and install water meters for RWS services that are not metered.
- Village Water Boards in coordination with Rural Water Department will identify operational funds and ensure regular audit be conducted for their RWS by a reputable auditing firm. Funding for this will come from Operational costs.
- Ministry of Labour, Local Government and Rural Water will revisit the appointment policy for Village Water Boards with intent of making recommendations for revision.

The focus of technology transfer should be on how technologies are received and mainstreamed into the development process (Tempo #67, 2008). Technologies must meet collectively identified adaptation needs and instil a sense of ownership by developing the software and orgware elements necessary to adopt and manage the hardware. The technology transfer should also be in synergy with current and planned intervention in adaptation and mitigation to climate variability and change in the target sectors. Adaptation therefore, becomes a form of sustainable development that supports self-defined positive and progressive change for communities and the society at large.

#### **CHAPTER 1.** Process for the identification of barriers and measures

#### **1.1 Objective and Methodology for the Barrier Analysis**

The objectives of the Barrier Analysis (BA) in the TNA process were to:

- Categorize the prioritized technologies and identify generic barriers and measures, using the literature and other supporting material;
- Identify the economic/non-economic barriers for each technology through a participatory consultative process;
- Prioritise barriers to select two/three critical barriers;
- Identify root causes and possible measures for the critical barriers prioritised; and
- Outline an enabling framework to overcome the barriers.

The TNA guidebook series "Overcoming Barriers to the Transfer and Diffusion of Climate Technologies" (Nygaard and Hansen 2015), UNEP-DTU training videos, and resource material from the desktop literature review provided guidelines for conducting the barrier analysis. The process followed included: background reviews; sector-based, small group stakeholder consultations; and field visits.

#### Literature Review

The consultant began the process with a desktop review of the relevant literature, including existing national policies, regulations, plans, strategies, annual reports and case studies from other countries and Belize. The information gathered from this review was complimented with informal interviews (face to face, telephone, email), input from sector small group stakeholders, other institutional experts, policymakers and end users. An initial list of possible barriers was prepared by the consultant, guided by the background research. Barriers in the initial list were grouped into two main categories: economic/financial barriers and non-financial barriers. Non-financial barriers included the following subcategories: policy/legislative/regulations, institutional/technology capacity, social and cultural tendencies, and information/awareness of technologies. The lists were then presented to the sector-based technical working groups (including Agriculture, Coastal and Marine Ecosystem, the Water sector and other market actors and interests groups) on different occasions for their review, refinement, and prioritisation/decomposition of critical or key barriers. The prioritized barriers were then examined using the recommended logical framework analysis including "problem/solution tree" evaluation and basic economic analysis for the agriculture sector technologies.

#### **Field Visits**

The consultant in the company of the agronomist/grain seed development expert and his assistant, visited the Ministry of Agriculture/Taiwanese Mission rice-seed breeding site at

Central Farm to investigate the process for grain-seed cultivation and production. Next, the team visited the site of the grain storage facility, that has been inoperable for some time, to check the technical specification of the cold storage equipment and discuss the grain-seed production initiatives of the Ministry of Agriculture Crop and Grain Production Unit. On several other occasions the Lead Consultant visited the office of the MOA Crop Research and Development Unit to discuss the status of drip and centre-pivot sprinkler irrigation systems, and operational use of tropical greenhouses and locally constructed crop protection Bel-houses.

Other visits were conducted by the Consultant to the Coastal Zone Management Authority and Institute database unit and the Fisheries Department to investigate how the data gathered from CZMAI small array of water quality monitoring sites are collected and processed. On a later occasion, the consultant visited the Public Health Bureau main office in Belmopan, to further discuss with the Director, the management and technical problems faced by some Rudimentary Water System (RWS), which often results in a complete shutdown of these village water services.

Face-to-face discussion were also held with officers of the Agriculture Extension Service (MOA), the Coordinator of Projects (MOA), Agro-forestry technician from the Forest Department, the director for Prosolar (A renewable energy company), and the director of GoGreenBelize.

#### Sector-based Technology Working Groups

Sector-based Technology Working Groups (STWGs) were formed to work on the BA for each technology. Each group consisted of four to five participants and met on several occasions to review the prioritized technologies, barriers and measures. Separate lists of these stakeholders are included in Annex III. The consultant, in collaboration with the TNA team, identified stakeholders for each STWG based on their related interests with respect to the sector technologies (Table 1). Participants included representatives from government, non-governmental organisations and the user community, namely: the Agronomist of the Grain & Fruit-tree Production Unit of the MOA, Director and Assistant from the Crop Research and Development Unit (CRDU-MOA), Director/Agronomist from CARDI, technical personnel from Fisheries and CZMAI, Director and Water Quality technician from Public Health (MOH) and personnel Rural Development Unit (Ministry of Labour, Local Government and Rural Development), and a technical representative from Prosolar and Chen Tech Limited.

Table 1 is a list of the key stakeholder agencies/departments in the Agriculture sector.

| Sector:         |              | Remarks   |              |              |              |                      |
|-----------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Agriculture     |              |           |              |              |              |                      |
|                 | Economic/    | Political | Adaptation & | Sustainable  | Livelihood   |                      |
| Crop & Grain    | Financiai    |           | Environment  | Development  | Security     | Crop and certified   |
| - Crop & Orall  |              |           | al           | al           |              | seed production and  |
|                 |              |           | N            | V            |              | sale to farmers      |
| Unit, MOA       |              |           |              |              |              |                      |
| - Crop          |              |           |              |              |              | R & D and training   |
| Research &      |              |           | 1            | 1            | 1            | in irrigation, crop  |
| Development     |              |           | N            | N            | N            | production, water    |
| Unit, MOA       |              |           |              |              |              | harvesting and crop  |
|                 |              |           |              |              |              | cover structures     |
| - CARDI         | $\checkmark$ |           |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Field test peppers,  |
|                 | •            |           |              | •            | •            | grains and tubers    |
| - Grain Growers | 1            |           |              | 1            |              | Four grain producer  |
| Representative  | V            |           |              | V            |              | cooperatives/groups  |
| - Extension     |              | .1        | 1            |              |              | MOA                  |
| Service MOA     |              | N         | N            | ٦            |              |                      |
| - DFC           |              |           |              |              |              | Low interest loan    |
|                 | $\checkmark$ |           |              |              |              | for Agriculture &    |
|                 |              |           |              |              |              | RE                   |
| - BETTRAIDE     |              |           |              |              |              | Technical support    |
|                 |              |           |              | $\checkmark$ |              | and investment       |
|                 |              |           |              |              |              | guidance             |
| - PROSOLAR      |              |           |              |              |              | Solar PV &           |
|                 | $\checkmark$ |           |              |              |              | Cooling system       |
|                 |              |           |              |              |              | provider & services  |
| - Chen Tech &   |              |           |              |              |              | Technical support    |
| Company         | $\checkmark$ |           |              |              |              | & irrigation         |
|                 |              |           |              |              |              | component supplier   |
| - FAO           |              |           | 1            | 2            |              | Donor, Technical     |
|                 |              |           | ×.           | V            |              | support              |
| - IICA          |              |           | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Technical Support    |
| - UNDP          |              |           |              |              |              | Implementer /        |
|                 |              |           | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | facilitator, focused |
|                 |              |           |              |              |              | on SDGs              |
| - Partners in   |              |           | .1           | -1           |              | CREI, SIRDI, etc.    |
| R&D             |              |           | N            | N            |              |                      |
| - UB Plant      |              |           |              |              |              | Propagatingsugar     |
| propagation     | $\checkmark$ |           | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | cane seedlings to    |
| facility        | T            |           | *            | ٦            | *            | BSI/ASR              |
| Tacinty         |              |           |              |              |              |                      |

Table 1: Categorization of Key Stakeholder Agencies in the Agriculture Sector

Table 2 and Table 3 contain the list of some of the other key stakeholders were contacted and participated in the Barrier Analysis process for the Marine and Coastal Zone sector and the Water sector, respectfully.

# Table 2: Categorization of Key Stakeholder Agencies in the Marine and Coastal Zone Sector

| Sector:                          |                        | Remarks      |              |                            |                        |                        |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Marine &                         |                        |              |              |                            |                        |                        |
| Coastal Zone                     |                        |              |              |                            |                        |                        |
|                                  | Economic/<br>Financial | Political    | Adaptation & | Sustainable<br>Development | Livelihood<br>Security |                        |
|                                  |                        |              | Environment  |                            | ~~~~                   |                        |
| - Fisheries                      |                        |              | 1            | I                          | 1                      | Leading GOB            |
| Dept.                            |                        |              | V            | N                          | V                      | Department for         |
| CZMAI                            |                        |              |              |                            |                        | Addresses issues on    |
| - CZMAI                          |                        |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$               | $\checkmark$           | Coastal Zone           |
|                                  |                        |              | *            |                            | •                      | management             |
| - MAFFESD                        |                        |              |              |                            |                        | Umbrella Ministry      |
|                                  |                        | $\checkmark$ |              |                            |                        | for Fisheries Dep and  |
|                                  |                        |              |              |                            |                        | CZMAI                  |
| - Fishers                        | $\checkmark$           |              |              |                            | $\checkmark$           | There are about 1,500  |
| Investors in                     |                        |              |              |                            |                        | Tisnerfolks            |
| - Investors in<br>Tourist Sector | $\checkmark$           |              |              |                            |                        | coastal development    |
| - Caribbean                      |                        |              |              |                            |                        | Creation of            |
| Fisherv                          |                        |              |              |                            |                        | management plans       |
| Management                       |                        | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$               |                        | for fishery resources  |
| Council                          |                        |              |              |                            |                        |                        |
| - UB-ERI &                       |                        |              |              |                            |                        | University of Belize   |
| Marine                           |                        |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$               |                        | Environmental          |
| Researchers                      |                        |              |              |                            |                        | Research Institute     |
| - PROSOLAR                       | al                     |              |              |                            |                        | RE supplier,           |
|                                  | V                      |              |              |                            |                        | technical support      |
| - Shrimp                         | $\checkmark$           |              |              | $\checkmark$               |                        | Eight major shrimp     |
| Farmers                          | ,                      |              |              | ,                          |                        | farms                  |
| - BTIA                           |                        |              |              |                            |                        | The tourism            |
|                                  |                        |              |              |                            |                        | association promotes   |
|                                  | $\checkmark$           | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$               |                        | leading industry for   |
|                                  |                        |              |              |                            |                        | foreign exchange &     |
|                                  |                        |              |              |                            |                        | GDP                    |
| - BELTRAIDE                      |                        |              |              |                            |                        | Facilitate investment  |
|                                  | $\checkmark$           |              |              | $\checkmark$               |                        | ventures in            |
|                                  |                        |              |              |                            |                        | Agriculture and RE,    |
| - Partners in                    |                        |              |              |                            |                        | WWF, NGOs Coral        |
| Coastal Zone                     |                        |              |              |                            |                        | Reef protection,       |
| Management                       |                        |              | 1            | ,                          | ,                      | Smithsonian Institute, |
| & SD,                            |                        |              | V            | V                          | $\checkmark$           | Oceana, UNDP, etc.     |
| Research and                     |                        |              |              |                            |                        |                        |
| Advocacy                         |                        |              |              |                            |                        |                        |

| Sector: Water   | Interests    |              |              |              |            | Remarks                 |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|-------------------------|
|                 | Economic/    | Political    | Adaptation   | Sustainable  | Livelihood |                         |
|                 | Financial    |              | &            | Development  | Security   |                         |
|                 |              |              | Environment  |              |            |                         |
| - Rural         |              |              |              |              |            | Along with SIF, the     |
| Development     |              |              |              |              |            | Rural Development       |
| Department      |              | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$ |            | Department              |
|                 |              |              |              | •            |            | (MLLGRD)                |
|                 |              |              |              |              |            | coordinate              |
|                 |              |              |              |              |            | establishment of RWS    |
| - Public Health |              |              |              | al           | al         | GOB Water Quality       |
| Bureau MOH      |              |              |              | N            | N          | laboratory & database   |
| - Social        |              |              |              |              |            | Financial mechanism     |
| Investment      |              |              |              |              |            | of GOB for poverty      |
| Fund (SIF)      | $\checkmark$ |              |              | $\checkmark$ |            | alleviation & basic     |
|                 |              |              |              |              |            | rural infrastructure &  |
|                 |              |              |              |              |            | social services         |
| - Village       |              | 1            |              |              |            | Governance              |
| Councils        |              | N            |              |              |            |                         |
| - Village Water |              |              |              |              |            | Management of RWS       |
| Board           | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |              |              |            | 0                       |
| Association     |              |              |              |              |            |                         |
| NAVCO           |              |              |              |              |            | National umbrella       |
| - NAVCO         |              | 1            |              |              |            | association for Village |
|                 |              | V            |              |              |            | Councils                |
| Undrology       |              |              |              |              |            | Monitoring              |
| - Hydrology     |              |              |              |              |            | abstraction and         |
| Dept.           |              |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |            | regulation of water     |
|                 |              |              |              |              |            |                         |
|                 |              |              |              |              |            | Dublic Health issues    |
| - PAHO          |              |              |              | al           |            | rublic realul issues,   |
|                 |              |              |              | V            |            |                         |
|                 |              |              |              |              |            | DE supplier technical   |
| - PRUSULAK      | $\checkmark$ |              |              |              |            | RE supplier, technical  |
|                 |              |              |              |              |            | support & services      |
| - Chen Tech     | 4            |              |              |              |            | i ecnnical support &    |
| Ltd.            | Ŷ            |              |              |              |            | irrigation component    |
|                 |              |              |              |              |            | supplier                |

 Table 3: Categorization of Key Stakeholder Agencies in the Water Sector

#### **1.1.1 Prioritisation of Barriers**

*Brainstorming barriers:* The STWGs met by sector (Agriculture, Coastal and Marine Ecosystems, and Water) at different occasions to reviewed and modified/added to the initial list of possible economic/financial and non-economic barriers. Each barrier was carefully analysed and screened to retain only the essential ones based on stakeholders' knowledge in the area, experience acquired and lessons learned from local, incumbent technology that haven been in used for several years in Belize.

*Selection and categorization:* Using a qualitative measure of relative importance such as a Likert-type Scale, barriers were classified as: 1. critical/killer/non-starter; 2. Crucial; 3. Important; 4. Less important; and 5. Insignificant. This was necessary since all barriers were not considered at an equal level or highly important.

*Ranking barriers:* Using the Likert scale 1 to 5, with 1 as 'non-starter' or killer barriers, and 5 'insignificant'; the barriers were ranked for further analysis. Based on the rationale to decompose only the 'killer/critical' barriers, it was decided that the two highest ranked barriers should be decomposed using the logical framework analysis (LFA). Table 4 below shows an example of the categorisation and ranking applied.

| No. | Barriers  | Criteria and Importance of Barriers for Technology 1 |         |           |           |               |      |
|-----|-----------|--|---------|-----------|-----------|---------------|------|
|     | Economic  | 1.   | 2.      | 3.        | 4. Less   | 5.            |      |
|     | &         | Critical   | Crucial | Important | important | Insignificant | Rank |
|     | Financial | (Killer,   |         |           |           | (easy         |      |
|     |           | non-   |         |           |           | starter)      |      |
|     |           | starter)   |         |           |           |               |      |
| 1   | Barrier A |  | Х       |           |           |               | 2    |
| 2   | Barrier B | Х  |         |           |           |               | 1    |
|     | Non-      |  |         |           |           |               |      |
|     | financial |  |         |           |           |               |      |
| 3   | Barrier C |  |         |           | X         |               | 4    |
| 4   | Barrier D | Х  |         |           |           |               | 1    |

 Table 4: Categorisation and Prioritisation Process for Barriers

Each critical or 'killer/non-starter' barrier was decomposed to find the causal relations and their resulting effects. See problem/objective trees for each identified focal problem/objective. The LFA was very useful in bringing together all the key elements of a problem and guide systematic and logical analysis of inter-linked key elements. According to the TNA guidelines, barriers may be decomposed at four levels:

- 1. Broad categories of barriers (e.g., economic and financial)
- 2. Barriers within a category (e.g., high cost of capital)
- 3. Elements of barriers (e.g., high interest rate).

4. Dimensions of barrier elements (e.g. an interest rate of 15% per annum for households).

Following the decomposition of the barriers to identify root causes, possible measures were identified to address those causes and overcome the barriers. Overlapping or cross-cutting barriers for each sector were identified to show the linkages among the barriers across the technologies. In this assessment of linkages, all barriers across the technologies for each sector, financial and non-financial were considered, with a focus on the critical barriers. This allowed for a wider range of measures to be captured in the enabling framework for the technologies.

#### 1.2 Category of Prioritized Technologies for the TNA process in Belize

Annex 1 shows a schematic diagram and a corresponding Table for the categorization of the prioritized technologies for the TNA process in Belize, including those for the Agriculture sector (adopted after Nygaard and Hansen, 2015; Schumacher, 1973). A summary of the categories is presented in Table 5 below.

In accordance with Table 5 the four prioritized technologies for the Agriculture Sector under the TNA process fall under Market Goods, in the sub-category of Consumer Goods. These technologies target the mass market, households, businesses and institutions. The general characteristics of such market goods are: number of potential consumers for goods is high; interactions with existing markets; supply chain can be large and complex; barriers may exist in all steps of the supply chain; and demands depends on consumer awareness and preferences.

Table 5 also shows that "The environmental and coastal/marine monitoring network for a marine early warning system", and "Integrated management plans for water safety in eight rural communities" fall under "Other non-market goods", and specifically, in the sub-category of "Technologies provided by public institutions'.

Table 6 shows a sample of improved 'Consumer Goods' and 'Capital Goods', and some corresponding incumbent consumer goods technologies and related barriers. Focusing on 'Consumer Goods', requirements and impacts for successful diffusion may include: costbenefit analysis and market surveys, review of tariffs and import duties/taxes on technology components, investment climate, demands and market conditions, technical training, and job opportunities for people that may help stimulate the local economy. Listed are some barriers to procurement, long-term sustainability, implementation, achieving change, market goods and services, and some key measures to facilitate the transfer and diffusion of the 'market goods' technologies. Table A1-3 (Annex A1) is a summary of "Non-market Goods" and "Other Non-Market Goods", adopted from Nygaard and Hansen, (2015). Table 6 and Table A1-3 were presented to key stakeholders as a general perspective on technology transfer and diffusion, and related barriers and measures to help define and evaluate the transfer/development of 'goods' connected with the prioritized technologies.

In the literature (Hecker et al. 2011, Nygaard and Hansen, 2015, Schumacher, 1973), "Nonmarket goods" are subdivided into "Publicly provided goods" and "Other non-market goods", as shown in Table 5 and Table A1-3. Publicly provided goods consist of large infrastructure projects requiring large investments, and generally publicly owned, and implemented/coordinated at the government level. Other requirement is an in depth socioeconomic Cost-benefit Analysis (CBA) and an Environmental Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), notwithstanding the procurement of capital financing.

Furthermore, "Other non-market goods" is subdivided into: i) "Technologies provided by public institutions"; ii) "Institutional change: Improved rural livelihood'; and iii) "Behavioural change at the individual level (i.e. change of practice)".

Examples of technologies categorized under "Other non-market goods – Technologies provided by public institutions", include: Early warning system for drought; Environmental Monitoring Network & Early Warning System for Coastal and Marine Resources, Integrated Ecosystems Management and Resource Use; Seasonal Weather Forecasts, etc. Barriers identified are listed as barriers to procurement, long-term sustainability, implementation, achieving change, market goods and services; while some key measures to facilitate the transfer and diffusion of 'other non-market goods' are listed for review (see Table A1-3, Annex 1A). As indicated earlier, the prioritized technology in Coastal and Marine Ecosystem sector and the Water sector are categorized under "Other non-market goods – Technologies provided by public institutions".

| Goods           | Category                 | Description  | Market characteristics  | Prioritized Technology   |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| Market<br>Goods | <b>Consumer</b><br>goods | -Goods targeting the<br>mass market;<br>households,<br>businesses and<br>institutions. | <ul> <li>a high number of potential consumers</li> <li>interaction with existing markets with extended and complicated supply chains</li> <li>barriers may exist in all steps in the supply chain</li> <li>demand depends on consumer awareness and preferences, marketing and promotional efforts</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Heat and drought resistant variety of open-pollinating corn and bean seeds for reproduction and marketing.</li> <li>Improved drip irrigation systems using rainwater harvesting and fertigation for crop nutrient requirement.</li> <li>In-country Irish potato clean-stock production unit to produce quality seed-tuber planting material varieties.</li> <li>Rehabilitation of crop</li> </ul> |

#### Table 5: Category of prioritized technologies

|                         |                                  |  |   | cover structure cooling<br>systems  |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
|                         | Capital<br>goods                 | Machinery and<br>equipment used in<br>the production of<br>goods, e.g. consumer<br>goods or electricity<br>or agro-processing<br>products  | <ul> <li>a limited number of<br/>potential sites/consumers</li> <li>relatively large capital<br/>investment simpler market<br/>chain</li> <li>demand is profit-driven and<br/>depends on demand for the<br/>products the capital goods<br/>are used to make</li> </ul>  |   |
| Non-<br>market<br>Goods | Publicly<br>provided<br>goods    | Technologies in this<br>category are often<br>(although not<br>always) publicly<br>owned, and<br>production of goods<br>and services are<br>available (free or<br>paid) to the public or<br>to a large group of<br>persons | <ul> <li>very few sites</li> <li>large investment,<br/>government/donor funding</li> <li>public ownership</li> <li>simple market chain;<br/>technology procured through<br/>national or international<br/>tenders.</li> <li>investments in large-scale<br/>technologies tend to be<br/>decided at the government<br/>level</li> </ul> |   |
|                         | Other<br>non-<br>market<br>goods | Non-tradable<br>technologies<br>transferred and<br>diffused under non-<br>market conditions,<br>whether by<br>governments, public<br>or non-profit<br>institutions,<br>international donors<br>or NGOs                     | <ul> <li>technologies are not<br/>transferred as part of a<br/>market but within a public,<br/>non-commercial domain.</li> <li>Serves overall political<br/>objectives, such as energy<br/>saving and poverty<br/>alleviation</li> <li>donor or government funding</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Improved environmental<br/>monitoring network and early<br/>warning system for Belize's<br/>coastal zone to increase<br/>resilience to climate change.</li> <li>An integrated management<br/>strategy for water safety for<br/>rural water supply systems in<br/>Belize</li> </ul> |

(Source: adopted from Nygaard and Hansen, 2015)

### Table 6: Sample of technologies and related barriers for Market Goods

| Market Goods |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|              | Consumer Goods   | Capital Goods  | Competing Consumer<br>Goods Technologies   |  |  |
| Examples     | <ul> <li>Solar water pumps</li> <li>Improved drip irrigation</li> <li>Climate resilient grain seed<br/>varieties</li> <li>Plant micro propagation of<br/>heat/drought resistant varieties</li> <li>Crop cover-structure/greenhouse<br/>cooling systems</li> <li>Mini hydro plant for renewable<br/>energy generation for small,<br/>farming households, communities,<br/>and water supply systems</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Cement factory</li> <li>Agro processing and consumer<br/>goods production</li> <li>Flood protection barriers</li> <li>Coastal protection<br/>infrastructure, etc</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Diesel/gasoline or direct<br/>current powered water<br/>pumps</li> <li>Manually operated<br/>irrigation; old, incumbent<br/>drip irrigation systems</li> <li>GMO or hybrid grain<br/>varieties</li> <li>Annually imported potato<br/>seeds that are not climate<br/>resilient</li> <li>Small diesel generator (50<br/>- 75 kWh)</li> <li>Inadequately designed</li> </ul> |  |  |

|                |  |                                 | greenhouses/cover                        |
|----------------|--|---------------------------------|--|
|                |  |                                 | structures for tropical                  |
|                |  |                                 | regions                                  |
| Requirements   | - CBA and market survey often          | - CBA and ESIA precede          | - Initial or capital investment          |
| and Impacts    | precedes initial investment            | capital investment              | - Import duties/taxes                    |
| 1              | - Tariffs and import duties/taxes for  | -Tariffs, import duties and     | - Subsidies                              |
|                | import of technology components        | taxes, incentives/subsidy       |  |
|                | - Demands and market conditions        | - Supply and demand.            |  |
|                | - Technical training and job           | marketing opportunities         |  |
|                | opportunities for people               | (local /                        |  |
|                | - Help stimulate local economy         | regional/international)         |  |
|                |  | - Legal and regulatory          |  |
|                |  | environment for investment      |  |
|                |  | - Enhance institutional and     |  |
|                |  | organization capacity in        |  |
|                |  | country                         |  |
|                |  | - Provide job opportunities and |  |
|                |  | stimulate the national          |  |
|                |  | economy                         |  |
| Barriers to    | - High initial cost for improved       | - High capital costs            | - Not considered: incumbent              |
| procurement    | technology (Cost improved              | - Monopoly and protection of    | technology already in                    |
| F              | technology minus cost incumbent        | incumbent technology            | operation and use                        |
|                | technology)                            | - Investment may be considered  | -  |
|                | - Clash with incumbent technology      | risky                           |  |
|                | - Uneven playing field                 | - Market controlled by          |  |
|                | - Few and inadequate suppliers of      | incumbent technology            |  |
|                | auxiliary goods and services           | -Uneven playing field arising   |  |
|                | - Legal and regulatory framework       | from subsidies on               |  |
|                | restricted                             | competing technologies          |  |
|                | - Poor technology                      | -Political influence            |  |
|                | quality/performance                    | -Legal and regulatory           |  |
|                | -Difficulty assessing finance          | framework not favourable        |  |
|                | -High interest rates                   | -Difficulty assessing finance   |  |
|                |  | and guarantee for loan          |  |
| Barriers to    | - High operational / maintenance costs | - High operational costs        | •  |
| long- term     | - Volatility of markets                | - High interest rates on loans  | -  |
| sustainability | - High interest rates                  | - Unpredictable markets         |  |
| Barriers to    | - Low in country technical and         | - Enabling business             | - Initial cost of production             |
| implementation | institutional capacity                 | environment unstable            | and risks                                |
| L              | - No incentives, high import duties    | - Cost and risk may supersede   | -  |
|                | and taxes                              | benefits                        | -  |
|                | - Weak connectivity between actors     | -                               |  |
|                | -Incumbent technology favoured         | -                               |  |
|                | -                                      |                                 |  |
| Barriers to    | -Mis-leading perception that           | - Unfavourable social and       | <ul> <li>Negative attitude of</li> </ul> |
| achieving      | traditional/incumbent technology       | cultural status                 | customers                                |
| change         | is better                              | - Market too small or limited   | - Low market demands                     |
|                | - General lack of interest among       | - Social and environmental      | -  |
|                | stakeholders because of mis-           | impacts may out weigh           |  |
|                | information or little information      | benefits in the long term       |  |

| Barriers to<br>market goods<br>& services | <ul> <li>Local self-service interests and<br/>monopoly</li> <li>Market volatility and small, limited<br/>market share</li> <li>Unsatisfactory services because of<br/>limited knowledge of new</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Monopoly of incumbent<br/>technology</li> <li>Unskilled technical workforce</li> <li>Consumer preferences and</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Protectionism and<br/>monopoly</li> <li>Limited knowledge of<br/>benefits</li> </ul>  |
|---|---|---|--|
|   | <ul> <li>technology and old equipment</li> <li>Limited stock of spares and<br/>components</li> <li>Exchange rates and correspondence<br/>banking issues, e.g. high risks</li> </ul>   | social/cultural biases  |  |
| Proposed<br>measures                      | <ul> <li>Develop awareness and education<br/>campaign on the benefits and<br/>advantages of new technology</li> <li>Government and statutory bodies<br/>redress constraints in investment<br/>climate</li> <li>Key stakeholder agencies (public<br/>and private) develop or improve<br/>mechanisms and identify market<br/>to attract investment in new<br/>technology</li> <li>Ministry of Agriculture, Coastal<br/>Zone Management<br/>Authorities/Fisheries, and Water<br/>Sector /Public Health agencies<br/>implement short and medium<br/>term strategic plans to facilitate<br/>technology transfer</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Government and partner<br/>institutions (e.g.<br/>BELTRAIDE, DFC,<br/>others) should amend laws,<br/>policies and regulations to<br/>facilitate investment/trade<br/>facilities</li> <li>Government introduces bill to<br/>provide incentives.<br/>Subsidies/tax reduction for<br/>establishment phase of new<br/>technology</li> <li>Government/strategic partners<br/>guarantee market for new<br/>technology, as case may be</li> <li>Government/strategic partners<br/>ensure policies and<br/>regulations in place for 'an<br/>even' playing field, and<br/>close loop holes against</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Remove restriction to<br/>introduction of<br/>technology and services</li> <li>Public awareness<br/>campaign by proponents</li> </ul> |

(Source: adopted from Nygaard and Hansen, 2015, with input from stakeholders in the Agriculture, Coastal Zone and Water sectors, May - August 2017)

#### **CHAPTER 2.** Agriculture sector

The focus of any technology transfer should be on how technologies are received and mainstreamed into the development process (Tempo #67, 2008). It is paramount therefore, that the technology transfer should also be in synergy with current and planned intervention in adaptation and mitigation to climate variability and change in the target sectors being considered. The prioritized technologies in the Agriculture sector are:

- 1. Heat and drought resistant variety of open-pollinating corn and bean seeds for reproduction and marketing.
- 2. Improved drip irrigation systems using rainwater harvesting and fertigation for crop nutrient requirement.
- 3. In-country Irish potato clean-stock production unit to produce quality seed-tuber planting material varieties.
- 4. Rehabilitation of crop cover structure cooling systems

The aims of these technologies transfer are the following: 1) Introduce climate resilient varieties of grain seeds and other crops among farming communities to ensure food security and stimulate the local economy; 2) Expand the use of improved drip irrigation and fertigation using solar powered water pumps and various forms of rainwater harvesting; 3) Utilized and expand the plant micro propagation facilities of the University of Belize to replicate fast-reproducing potato seedlings for more small farmers to participate in potato cultivation; and 4) Rehabilitate greenhouses/crop cover structures with efficient, solar powered cooling systems to help modify the elevated temperature and create a more comfortable environment conducive for the farmers and crop development.

This chapter discusses the preliminary targets for the transfer and diffusion of the prioritised technologies, the barriers which are likely to hinder/prevent their deployment/uptake and the possible enabling measures to overcome those barriers. The analysis will examine linkages among the barriers and identify possible solutions to create an enabling framework

#### **2.1 Preliminary targets for technology transfer and diffusion in Agriculture**

An overview of the targets of the technologies for the Agriculture sector and the potential benefits to stakeholders that are likely to be affected by climate change is presented in this section. The last agriculture census in Belize indicted that there were approximately 12,000 farmers; 24% of farmers had less than 5 acres, 33% between 5 and 20 acres, and 74% of farms

are less than 50 acres in size (FAO, 2011). The majority of land used for agriculture (37%) was classified as shifting agriculture and unimproved pastures, followed by mechanized agriculture for grains practices primarily by the bigger, Mennonite farmers, who cultivate most hybrid varieties. The targets for the technologies are aimed at the majority of small farmers who are more vulnerable to the vagaries of the climate, the instability of the markets and externalities. The targets of technology transfer and diffusion in the agriculture sector include:

- 1) Production of heat and drought resistant varieties of open-pollinating corn and beans certified seeds. The target beneficiaries are small famers involve in the seasonal cultivation of corn and beans. It is estimated that there are over 7,000 small farmers cultivating 10 acres of less of rainfed grains seasonally. The climate resilient varieties of corn and beans 'breeder' seeds will be imported by the Ministry of Agriculture and partitioned among four certified grain producing cooperatives and the MOA Crop/Seed Production Unit. Each certified seed production group will have received 400 lbs for the first year and 200 lbs for the second year. The certified seed production groups will then cultivate these varieties under controlled conditions for the production of certified seeds as exemplify in the schematic below. The certified seeds will then be packaged in units of 25 lbs. and marketed to 200 small farmers in the six districts for a minimal price to cover purchase and production costs. The funds will then be reused for purchasing of new breeder seed varieties in the fourth year to commence the cycle once again. Farmers will also be able to use some of their grain seeds as planting material in the second and third year. The cycle recommenced in the fourth and fifth year, when new breeder seeds are purchased from abroad to strengthen and replenish the variety.
- 2) Improved drip irrigation systems using rainwater harvesting and fertigation for crop nutrient requirement. The target for this technology aims at improving and expanding drip irrigation technology among 150 small farmers to enhance yields in horticulture and vegetable productions for the local market. Improved drip irrigation/fertigation system demonstration centres will be upgraded in all districts, including the agriculture training facility at the National Agriculture Showgrounds in Belmopan. Initial acquisition of the improved drip/fertigation irrigation system and training of groups of farmers (25 farmers/district) will be an integral part of this piloted technology transfer.
- 3) In-country Irish potato clean-stock production unit to produce quality seed-tuber planting material varieties. Potato is currently produced by small-scale farmers in San Antonio, Upper and Lower Barton Creek, Springfield village, La Gracia, and El Progresso in the Cayo District. Smaller quantities are cultivated in the Orange Walk, Corozal and Stann Creek districts. Potato varieties cultivated require cool conditions for tuber development, and these farming communities have the required conditions for growing these varieties during the cool period of November to February. The Red la Roche, Red la Soda and Red Pontiac potato varieties are the varieties mostly planted in Belize. There are approximately 15 main potato-farming communities in Belize (MOA
factsheet for Potato seed importers, 2014-15). In 2016, the production of potato was 2,173,000 lbs on 245 acres (yield 8,869 lb/acre or 21,915.8 lbs/ha). This annual production was low compared with the peak production of 2,231,100 lbs on 108 acres in 2013 resulting in a yield 20,658 lb/acre (51,047.0 lbs/ha). See Crop production table in Annex III for detail. The estimated production for 2017-18 potato-growing season that ended in February was: 3.7 million lbs, with a breakdown of 2.8 million lbs in the Cayo District, 588,000 in the Corozal District, 286,000 lbs in the Orange Walk District and 45,000 lbs in the Stann Creek District (MOA Press Release, January 24, 2018). The technology to reproduce climate resilient varieties of potato for tropical region in Belize, via plant micro propagation technology (University of Belize, School of Agriculture in Central Farm), is aimed at micro propagating these improved varieties in Belize in larger proportions for eventual redistribution of clean, certified potato seed tuber, certified seed tubers to an expanded number of potato-growing farmers. The funds from the sales will be used to improve the micro-propagation process and buy new seeds after a period of 4 years.

4) Rehabilitation of crop cover structure cooling systems. The Government of Belize, through project funding, bought a total of 30 greenhouses at unit rate of BZ\$ 30,000.00 back in 2010. Some of these greenhouses are still in operation but the majority have fallen in disrepair and abandoned. Over the years the CRDU has also been refining the construction of Bel Tunnel cover structures, similar in design to the Tropical Greenhouse, but smaller in size. The technology transfer aims at installing improved cooling systems in at least eight (8) crop cover structures (greenhouses) in operational use around the country, with the capacity to address the inefficient cooling systems for other crop cover structures as demands for this service increases. The beneficiaries will be both small and medium-size farmers utilizing crop cover structures.

Table 7 below is a summary of technology targets for the agriculture sector and cost – benefit

| Table 7: Targets and possibility of attainment of agriculture technology diffusion |                         |                      |                         |  |  |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| Sector: Technology   | Targets                 | Too Ambitious        | Conservative            |  |  |
| Agriculture  |                         |                      |                         |  |  |
| 1. Climate resilient   | Small farmers           | No. Majority of      | GOB & certified grain   |  |  |
| open-pollinated  | cooperatives and        | small farmers        | seed producers can      |  |  |
| certified corn &   | farmers groups, and     | cultivate non-       | procure funds to cover  |  |  |
| bean seeds   | individual farmers in   | resilient grains     | initial cost of breeder |  |  |
|  | all six districts. The  | and/or hybrids under | seeds. Sources are:     |  |  |
|  | estimate is at least 50 | rainfed agriculture  | CIAT in Colombia, and   |  |  |
|  | small & medium-         | system.              | CIMMYI in Mexico.       |  |  |
|  | scale farmers per       |                      | Cost of seed production |  |  |
|  | district purchasing     |                      | for 3 seed-producing    |  |  |
|  | certified, climate      |                      | cooperatives and the    |  |  |

evaluation. See Annex II for a preliminary economic analysis for the of interventions.

|   | resilient grain seeds.  |  | MOA Grain Unit<br>cultivating six acres:<br>estimated<br><b>Capital cost:</b> US\$<br>170,000 including drip<br>irrigation and solar<br>pumps (Annex 1).<br><b>Operational costs:</b><br>US\$ 23,000.00.<br>CBA for grain seed<br>production per hectare:<br>Capital cost per hectare<br>for certified seed<br>production US\$<br>421.50/ha<br>Operational Costs<br>(inputs) for farmers to<br>cultivate one-hectare<br>incumbent: US\$<br>399.00/ha  |
|---|---|--|---|
| 2. Improved drip<br>irrigation &<br>fertigation   | Sixty small/medium-<br>size farmers<br>countrywide (20 per<br>district). Farmers will<br>be trained to setup<br>and operate improved<br>drip/ fertigation<br>irrigation systems,<br>coupled with water<br>harvesting and RE<br>solar-powered water<br>pumps where needed. | No. Many farming<br>cooperatives or<br>farmer's groups, and<br>individual farmers<br>are utilizing the<br>incumbent, low-<br>efficient drip<br>irrigation<br>technology. | The focus is to upgrade<br>the technology,<br>incorporating<br>fertigation, water<br>harvesting and/or RE<br>technology for water<br>pumps. Incentives and<br>import tax exemptions<br>can be requested, in<br>addition to low- interest<br>loan facilities for small<br>farmers (e.g. from<br>DFC, Credit Unions,<br>National Bank, etc.).<br>Preliminary estimate of<br><b>Capital costs:</b> US\$<br>126,800.00, with solar<br>energy-driven pumps.<br><b>Operational costs:</b><br>US\$ 45,000.00 |
| <ol> <li>In-country micro-<br/>propagation of<br/>clean stock,<br/>climate resilient</li> </ol> | Country-propagated<br>certified, clean stock<br>climate resilient,<br>potato seeds for  | Might be too<br>ambitious. Initial<br>cost to establish a<br>potato micro-   | Not too conservative.<br>Initial costs for<br>improving the plant<br>micro-propagation  |

| Irish Potato seeds  | current population of  | propagation          | laboratory and             |
|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
|                     | 25 potato-growing      | programme from       | producing certified        |
|                     | farmers, plus another  | procurement of       | seeds is high. Requires    |
|                     | 50 from the six $(6)$  | clean tubers to      | a comprehensive CBA.       |
|                     | districts in Belize.   | certified tubers for | Estimated capital cost     |
|                     |                        | sale to famers is    | US\$ 337,000;              |
|                     |                        | high within a        | <b>Operating costs</b> (5- |
|                     |                        | timeframe about 5-   | year period): US\$         |
|                     |                        | years. (see Annex    | 625,000.                   |
|                     |                        | IV)                  |                            |
| 4. Improved cooling | Refurbishing cooling   | Initial cost for     | Yes.                       |
| system for Crop     | systems for at least 7 | cooling system       | Capital Costs: US\$        |
| cover structures    | crop covered           | components could     | 109,500.00 for cooling     |
| (Tropical           | structures. The        | be high for          | system refurbishment       |
| Greenhouses         | intention is to        | individual small     | of (7) Bell Tunnel         |
|                     | develop a business     | farmers.             | Covered structures.        |
|                     | for rehabilitation of  |                      | <b>Operational costs:</b>  |
|                     | existing covered       |                      | US\$ 28,000.00 for         |
|                     | structure cooling      |                      | three years (spares &      |
|                     | system as demands      |                      | maintenance).              |
|                     | for installation       |                      |                            |
|                     | increase.              |                      |                            |

## **2.1.1 Institutional framework**

In Belize, the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry, The Environment, and Sustainable Development (MAFFESD) is the Ministry responsible for the coordination and implementation of Sustainable Development and Climate Change policies in Belize. The National Climate Change Office (NCCO) under this Ministry plays a leading role in coordinating the work of the National Climate Change Committee (NCCC), which has wide representation from the public and private sectors and has the mandate to spearhead climate change actions at the local, regional and international levels. The NCCC is organized into sub-groups to address the various aspects of climate change.

The Ministry of Agriculture partners with several local, regional and international institutions to promote sustainable agriculture in Belize.

The agriculture sector policy and institutional framework guides the climate change adaptation strategy, and will determine decisions to be made, and the most suitable entities to implement the proposed TNA prioritized adaptation technologies for the sector. The proposed Technology Action Plan (TAP) will be the strategic mechanism to facilitate the sourcing of funds for the technology transfer at the national, regional and international levels. The availability of the necessary human and material resources, what measures/interventions have already been

initiated, complementarity and partnering needs, supportive proposed and/or adopted policies and systems, jurisdiction, improvement needs and remaining barriers to be properly addressed to facilitate the technology transfer, will all be considered per technology in the TAP.

## 2.1.2 Ministry of Agriculture

The Ministry of Agriculture is guided by the National Agriculture and Food Policy (NAFP) 2015-2030, with the strategic objective of increasing agricultural production, productivity, competitiveness, and market opportunities. Emphasis is being placed on innovation, research and development, and partnerships to capitalize on available opportunities that have a comparative advantage.

Vision: "A transformed/modern sector that is fully competitive, diversified and sustainable".

*Mission:* "To continue as the economic pillar of Belize, ensuring food security, generating income and foreign exchange, creating employment, and conserving natural resources, in order to grow the economy, reduce poverty and empower the local population for sustainable development".

*Strategic Goal:* "Contribute to the overall GDP growth and national household incomes and growth in export earnings".

Strategic objectives for the Agriculture Sector in Belize are to:

- Stimulate and facilitate agricultural and fisheries sector growth and reduce rural poverty;
- Create the enabling and favourable environment to increase the efficiency, productivity, profitability and competitiveness of the agriculture, fisheries and cooperative sectors;
- Accelerate the diversification in production, processing and exports;
- Improve and conserve the natural and productive resource base to ensure long-term sustainable productivity and viability;
- Improve access to productive resources and services and create economic opportunities for small/young farmers, women and indigenous people, particularly in poor, marginal areas;
- Strengthen the institutional capacities to provide effective support in marketing and trade, research and extension, as well as relevant education and training;
- Increase food production, enhance food security and improve the nutritional status of the population, as well as increasing farm incomes; and
- Strengthen inter-sectoral linkages, in particular with the social sectors of health and education, as well as with the strategy and action plan for poverty eradication, (www.agriculture.gov.bz, retrieved June, 2017).

The over-arching goal of the NAFP is "to engender a conducive environment for the development of an Agriculture and Food Sector that is competitive, diversified, and

sustainable; that enhances food security and nutrition; and that contributes to the achievement of the socio-economic development goals of Belize" (GOB, 2015).

## Short-term strategic plan for corn and beans cultivation

### **Program:** Crops and fruit trees

This strategic plan is derived from the workplans submitted by the different units of the Crops Section.

## Thematic area: Diversification

Objective: To facilitate agricultural diversification through the promotion of viable crop and fruit tree commodities that contribute to economic development and opportunities of rural producers.

## Timeframe: 2017 - 2020

Strategy matrix: Table 8 shows the short-term strategy proposed by MOA for corn and beans production. It is recommended that future initiatives or technology transfer in climate resilient, certified grain seed production should be streamlined with the MOA's short to medium-term strategy and actions.

| Target<br>Commodity | Objective                             | Components<br>(how? Strategy)   | Deliverables<br>(2017-18)  | Location                    | Lead<br>Person | Partners          |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Corn (Zea<br>mays)  | Support corn                          | 1. Maintain a reliable supply of Open   | 1. A report on the demand for yellow   | Central<br>Farm             | M.<br>Trujillo | CARDI             |
|                     | production<br>among rural             | Pollinated (OP) stock seed for rural  | and white OP quality seed on a seasonal and  | Central<br>Farm             | M.<br>Trujillo | producers         |
|                     | producers<br>for food<br>security and | producers.<br>2. Strengthen the selection of climate  | yearly basis.<br>2. Trained selected<br>producers in quality   | OW, Cayo,<br>S/C,<br>Toledo | M.<br>Trujillo | Extension         |
|                     | generation.                           | <ul> <li>selection of chinate</li> <li>resilient germplasm</li> <li>(local or introduced)</li> <li>that is tolerant to pest</li> <li>and diseases.</li> <li>3. Promote biofortified</li> <li>varieties of corn to</li> <li>enhance nutrition.</li> <li>4. Develop and</li> <li>implement an</li> <li>integrated pest and</li> <li>disease mgmt. for corn</li> <li>production.</li> <li>5. Strengthen</li> <li>production systems for</li> <li>seed and grain to be</li> <li>cost effective,</li> <li>sustainable and climate</li> <li>resilient.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>producers in quality</li> <li>corn seed production.</li> <li>3. Four acres of</li> <li>yellow OP corn</li> <li>established for seed</li> <li>production in four</li> <li>districts with producer</li> <li>groups.</li> <li>4. 20,000 lbs of</li> <li>yellow OP corn seed</li> <li>with 95% germination</li> <li>rate produced at</li> <li>C/Farm.</li> <li>5. A protocol for the</li> <li>production and quality</li> <li>assessment of OP corn</li> <li>seed.</li> <li>6. A report on bio-</li> <li>fortified and</li> <li>heat/drought tolerant</li> <li>varieties available</li> <li>rationally</li> </ul> | Toledo                      |                | CIMMYT,<br>INIAS, |
| Beans               | Support                               | 1. Maintain a reliable  | 1. 5000 lbs of small   | Central                     | M.             | CARDI             |
| (Phaseolus          | production                            | supply of quality seed  | red bean seed with   | Farm                        | Trujillo       |                   |

### Table 8: Strategic matrix for corn and beans production

| vulgaris) | of pulses             | of small red and black beans   | 95% germination rate   | OW, CYO,<br>S/C_Tol  | M.<br>Truiillo | Extension               |
|-----------|-----------------------|--|--|----------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
|           | producers<br>for food | 2. Strengthen the selection of climate   | 2. 5000 lbs of black<br>bean seed with 95%   | OW, CYO,<br>S/C, Tol | M.<br>Trujillo | Extension               |
|           | security and          | resilient germplasm  | germination rate   |                      |                |                         |
|           | generation.           | <ul><li>that is tolerant to pest<br/>and diseases.</li><li>3. Promote biofortified<br/>varieties of pulses to<br/>enhance nutrition.</li><li>4. Develop and<br/>implement an<br/>integrated pest and</li></ul> | <ul> <li>3. Four acres of small</li> <li>red beans established</li> <li>for seed production in</li> <li>four districts with</li> <li>producer groups</li> <li>4. Four acres of small</li> <li>black beans</li> <li>established for seed</li> </ul> |                      |                | CIAT,<br>INIAS,<br>etc. |
|           |                       | disease mgmt. for<br>coconuts<br>5. Strengthen   | production in four<br>districts with producer<br>groups  |                      |                |                         |
|           |                       | be cost effective,<br>sustainable and climate<br>resilient.<br>6. Promote good post-   | 5. A report on the<br>demand for yellow<br>and white OP quality<br>seed indicating<br>seasonal and yearly  |                      |                |                         |
|           |                       | harvesting practices among producers.  | demand.<br>6. A protocol for the<br>production and quality<br>assessment bean seed.<br>7. A report on bio-   |                      |                |                         |
|           |                       |  | fortified and<br>heat/drought tolerant<br>varieties available<br>regionally.   |                      |                |                         |

(Source: Strategic action plan 2017-2020. Ministry of Agriculture, July 2017)

Some short and medium-term measures contributing to an enabling environment as proposed by MOA

With respect to the proposed technologies in the Agriculture sector, stakeholders at the policy level and others in consultative small group meetings, pointed out that some measures that may contribute to current and future enabling environment for technology transfer in the sector are:

- 1. Strengthen technical cooperation and cooperation with regional institutions such as: CARDI, IICA, INFAP, Mexican Scientific and Technical Cooperation (AMEXCID).
- 2. Accelerate the initiative to strengthen MOA's Research and Extension Service, including a greater emphasis in the use of ICT.
- 3. Implement programme with the IDB, to improve and systematize its agriculture data and information in a way that is readily accessible for decision making.
- 4. Fast-track, at policy level, technical cooperation projects with FAO, CDB, IFAD, and other partners, etc.
- 5. Advocate at policy level, the adoption of the National Agriculture and Food Policy 2015-2030, and the drafting and adoption of an updated Agriculture Development, Management and Operational Strategy (ADMOS), that will both help to steer sustainable agricultural development in Belize for the short and medium term.

## 2.1.3 Overview of barriers to the diffusion of technologies in the Agriculture Sector

Stakeholders in the Agriculture Sector both at the policy and technical levels, and partners in the sector, listed a series of barriers to consider in technology transfer of heat and drought resistant varieties of open-pollinated corn and beans seeds, other climate resilient crops; micropropagated, climate resilient potato seed tubers; improved drip irrigation & fertigation systems; and improved technology for crop cover structures (e.g. Cooling system and solar PV components). The preliminary list of barriers included:

- Inadequate and incoherent policy incentive frameworks e.g. absence of a seed policy.
- No national seed/crop certification mechanism and unit.
- Limited capacity in crop research and development.
- Weak governance systems and mechanisms—monitoring and evaluation systems are still in infancy stages; regulations that support contract farming or provide a fair operating field for producers and buyers is not available.
- Local market opportunities are limited (i.e. agricultural storage and service centres) not well developed, still in infancy).
- 'Value added' not fully embraced among small producers and agro-processors.
- Poor infrastructure, including SPS standards, food safety monitoring.
- Affordable credit and financing not easily accessible to small producers.
- Low levels of productivity and high production costs especially fuel, agro-inputs.
- Limited research and deficient extension services to support rural producers.
- Limited or lack of relevant information on technologies-their advantages, costs and benefits to improve yields and reduce impacts on the environment.
- Limited technologies and usage.
- High up-front cost for new technologies.
- Limited resilience capacity to risks and natural disasters.
- Institutional conflicts and overlapping roles, (turf protection).
- Striking a balance between increased land use change for agricultural expansion and a healthy and secured biodiversity for present and future generations.
- Limited and accessible financial mechanisms for small farmers.
- Land tenure issues.
- Elevated financial risks arising from extreme climatic events and unfavourable market conditions.
- Poor infrastructure in remote localities.
- Rising cost of fuel for operation and transport.
- Younger generation not fully interested or engaged in agriculture.
- Limited technical capacity in the agriculture sector, especially among small farmers.
- Increased praedial larceny.
- Increasing costs of agriculture inputs.
- Majority of small farmers have limited education.
- Competition with incumbent technologies and interest groups.

The barriers were further classified under "Economic/financial" and "Non-financial" barriers and were arranged according to key components for these technologies as illustrated below.

## • Economic and Financial Barriers

High up-front costs for establishment of a sustainable and profitable 'certified' corn and beans seed production system will discourage grain producers in making this investment, as market may be too small. Elevated import duties and taxes on components of solar PV systems and cooling fans, tropical greenhouses, water pumps, and miscellaneous agro technology equipment. Cost of maintenance of improved agro-technology systems can also be high fpr individual small or medium-scale farmers, for example: grain cold storage systems/facilities, multilple crop cover structure cooling systems, expanded plant micro propagation laboratory facilities, farm mechanization, etc. Also, elevated financial risks resulting from crop failure, and limited, attractive, low-interest financial mechanisms for small producers are constraints that discourages inestments. Unfavourable market environment can also discourage farmers from investing in large-scale production of certain crops (e.g. corn, beans, potato, onions, etc.). because of unpredictable importation of such commodities flooding the market, low prices at harvest time, and inadequate storage technology and facilities.

### Non-financial barriers.

## Organizational/regulatory Barriers

Several departments and partner organizations including: MOA Fruit Trees and Grain Production Unit, the Crop Research and Development Unit (CRDU), farmers groups/cooperatives, research units in industry and academia, e.g. CARDI, CREI, UB and others, tend to work in isolation, with limited coordination and sharing of information. Regulatory framework for R&D in crop production/marketing etc. may exist but not fully implemented.

### • Enabling policy environments for Drip/Sprinkler irrigation systems and Solar PV

Currently, duty is paid on components of drip/sprinkler irrigation/fertigation systems, and Solar PV at the same rate as imports of other hardware equipment, construction and building components. Inadequate and incoherent policy incentive frameworks e.g. absence of a National Seed policy, establishment of a Seed/Crop Certification Unit/Institution and adopting and implementing the draft irrigation policy and strategy (GOB/FAO, 2015) are barriers that can be addressed to help facilitate the transfer and diffusion of climate resilient grains and crops that can help farmers adapt to climate change, improve their livelihood and ensure food security.

### • Incumbent Technology

Agro-businesses and more progressive farmers in Belize have been using older technologies and applications in drip/sprinkler irrigation systems, hybrids varieties of corn and other grains beans, over-heated tropical greenhouses and cool-season potato varieties for some time now, so investing in new technologies may appear difficult and costly. Moreover, the incumbent technology may be profitable under current conditions, and farmers may be very familiar with operations and maintenance, so switching to a new, unfamiliar technology appears risky, and too costly for small farmers who would want the improved technologies.

#### • Information Barriers

Information barriers include limited access to relevant information on technologies, which could provide potential customers with a knowledge on the viability of investing in new technologies. Prices and quality of complete drip irrigation units, grain cool storage units and cooling fans and electric water pumps, solar PV components and miscellaneous parts for the various technologies can vary, so customers need to know which model will yield better return on their investments. Information barriers may arise due to poor extension services, lack of information dissemination and training, and limited coordination among key actors in the market chain (manufacturers/primary producers, importers and large-scale processors, retailors, service providers and maintenance, and market end users/clients).

### • Technical Barriers

Few skilled persons can properly install and maintain improved drip/sprinkler irrigation systems, cooling systems for crop cover structures, "certified" grain seed production and storage, and plant micro-propagation technology, certified and commercial seed production, and marketing. In Belize, this is usually done by Agronomists and Horticulture technicians at CARDI, Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) Fruit-tree and Grain Production Unit, MOA Crop Research and Development Unit (CRDU), agrobusiness technicians, and other professional groups/companies who technical service for installation and maintenance of complex electrical equipment and renewable energy systems. Improper installations, lack of adequate maintenance, or inferior model/brand of equipment may result in accidents and failure. This may lead to delayed of returns on investments or a loss of investments, and unprofitable yields that may discourage agro-businesses and farmers in the usage of the new technology.

# 2.2 Barrier analysis and possible enabling measures for heat and drought resistant varieties of open-pollinating corn and beans seeds

The recommendation from stakeholders on climate resilient crops indicates that crops for technology transfer should be grains, specifically yellow corn, and beans (Small Red, Red Kidney, and Black Beans). The technology for improved grain production in Belize is at the top of the MOA's list of crops being promoted in its strategy to ensure food safety and livelihood security among small farmers and farming communities in Belize (R. Thompson, Agriculture Officer responsible for Projects, personal communication, September 2017). Thus, the technology will encompass not only the new varieties of open pollinated corn and bean seeds, but also the complete process from land preparation, planting, harvesting, storage of grains, marketing and replanting. Seed production groups will ensure the viability of the seed stock. Seed for planting and marketing will be available to famers at a reasonable price.

# **2.2.1** General description of heat and drought resistant varieties of corn and beans seeds

The proposed technology transfer to produce heat and drought resistant variety of openpollinated corn and bean seeds for production and marketing among small farmers in Belize through the Technology Needs Assessment project (UNEP/DTU, 2013), is an initiative being promoted by the Ministry of Agriculture to increase the capacity of four farming cooperatives and its Grain Production Unit at Central Farm. The objective is to expand the production of climate resilient quality corn and beans seeds for supplying to small farmers, and four farming cooperatives to produce corn and black bean grain for the local market. The intervention will run for three years.

Capacity–Through a FAO project, many farmers have already been exposed to good quality seeds and have seen the results. They have also been introduced to planting to the techniques of planting in rows and proper storage facility. This has been transmitted through Farmer Field School methodologies. The Climate Change adaptation intervention will assist to establish plots, threshing equipment, shelling equipment, cold storage bins, procurement of quality seeds, agro-chemicals, drip irrigation and marketing. The target farming cooperatives are:

- 1) Valley of Peace Farmers Cooperative consists of eight (8) active members. This group will be provided with improved drip irrigation system to enhance the old system they are using and will be engaged in quality corn and black bean seed production to supply the demand among local, small farmers.
- 2) Silver Creek Village Farmers Cooperative will be supplied with improved drip irrigation system and will also be engaged in the business of quality corn and black bean seed production and sale to other small farmers.
- 3) *Red Bank Village Farmers Group* will also be engaged in quality corn and black bean seed reproduction under improved drip irrigation supplied through the TNA project technology transfer.
- 4) San Carlos Village New River Farmers Cooperative (Orange Walk District) consist of 26 members. The combine acreage among members is in excess of 500 acres, but the Group is only using 1/10 of the land. The San Carlos group is producing vegetables, water melon, onions, potato, and also corn and beans. The Group has 16 wells from which they abstract water to irrigate their vegetable and onion crop. Corn and black beans are not irrigated at present.

This San Carlos Group is in need of improved irrigation systems to help reduce losses due to recurrent droughts. The proposed intervention will supply the Group with improved drip irrigation systems. The San Carlos Farmers Cooperative plans to increase their yellow and white corn, and black beans production to supply the local market demand.

The Ministry of Agriculture Crop Production Unit (Central Farm Group) is involved in seed production of grain crops such as corn, beans and rice. This group will also participate in this intervention. The Crop Unit will be provided with an improved grain storage facility, and other material to continue producing seasonal, heat resistant grain during the project cycle. The Unit will also be responsible for coordination of the climate resistant grain seed production under the TNA intervention.

The Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institute (CARDI Belize) will be the agency responsible for the conservation of seed Germplasm. The objective is to safeguard the quality and integrity of the varieties overtime.

The proposed intervention will have positive impacts on marginalized communities, families and small farmers. Pest incidence on hybrid is much more prevalent than for open pollinated, so additional input to address pest will not be necessary. A simplified production chain for quality corn and black bean seed and other grain is illustrated in the following schematic:



Schematic of production chain for quality corn and bean seeds

It is envisioned that with an efficient drip irrigation or sprinkler irrigation system, the San Carlos Group can attain yields of corn in the order of 5000 lbs./acre which would be exceptional and profitable.

Table 9 shows the recent yields in grain and potato cultivation in Belize. The records are for the period 2010 to 2016, for both *milpa* and mechanized production.

Focusing on the mechanized and semi-mechanized production one can observe yields of 0.74 tons per hectare for black beans, 3.86 tons per hectare for yellow corn, 2.69 tons per hectare for white corn, and 11.87 tons per hectare for semi-mechanized potato cultivation. A table with the detail production and yields can be seen in Annex 1B. Cost estimates for cultivation of one acre of grain and potato are contained Annex II for review. The estimates were used evaluate the Net Present Value (NPV) for such crops, as a means to highlight the economic barriers for climate resilient varieties of grain and potato seedling technology transfer and diffusion.

## Table 9: Recent average yields in grain and potato productionin Belize for the period 2010-2016

(Source: MOA Marketing Information Unit, 2017)

| PRODUCTS           | Average Yields |           |  |
|--------------------|----------------|-----------|--|
| GRAINS,<br>BEANS   | (lbs)/acre     | tons/ha   |  |
| <b>BLACK BEANS</b> |                |           |  |
| Mechanized         |                |           |  |
| Production (lbs)   | 734,525        | 333.18    |  |
| Acres              | 1,106.6        | 447.84    |  |
| Yield (lb)         | 663.77         | 0.74      |  |
| Milpa              |                |           |  |
| Production (lbs)   | 2,917,459.63   | 1,323.35  |  |
| Acres              | 3,392.66       | 1,373.01  |  |
| Yield              | 859.93         | 0.96      |  |
| <b>CORN Yellow</b> |                |           |  |
| Milpa:             |                |           |  |
| Production (lbs)   | 6,364,300.43   | 2,886.83  |  |
| Acres              | 5,064.29       | 2,049.52  |  |
| Yield (lb)         | 1,256.70       | 1.41      |  |
| Mechanized:        |                |           |  |
| Production (lbs)   | 117,853,165.29 | 53,457.85 |  |
| Acres              | 34,220.14      | 13,848.89 |  |
| Yield (lb)         | 3,443.97       | 3.86      |  |
| <b>CORN</b> White  |                |           |  |
| Milpa:             |                |           |  |
| Production (lbs)   | 8,349,154.14   | 3,787.15  |  |
| Acres              | 6,125.57       | 2,479.02  |  |
| Yield (lb)         | 1,363.00       | 1.53      |  |
| Mechanized:        |                |           |  |
| Production (lbs)   | 8,225,090.00   | 3,730.88  |  |
| Acres              | 3,431.43       | 1,388.70  |  |
| Yield (lb)         | 2,396.99       | 2.69      |  |
| Irish Potato       | (lbs)/acre     | tons/ha   |  |
| Production (lbs)   | 2,331,505.29   | 1,057.56  |  |
| Acres              | 220.14         | 89.09     |  |
| Yields             | 10.590.87      | 11.87     |  |

International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT- Colombia)

Since its foundation on 17 October 1967, the CIAT has collaborated closely with its host country, Colombia, focusing on the shared conviction that agriculture research is an important tool for generating new technologies, methods, and knowledge that enable farmers, particularly low-income smallholders, to make their production more eco-efficient: that is, competitive, profitable, sustainable, and resilient. Among its achievements are: more than 90 improved varieties of four key crops-rice (48), tropical forage (11), common bean (16), and cassava (18) (CIAT information sheet retrieved from www.ciat.cgiar.org/, Nov. 2017). CIAT's 50-years of research has provided the Centre with a strong platform from which to project its work through cooperative ventures, to the rest of Latin America and the Caribbean. CIAT is one of the regional processors of climateresilient breeder beans seeds.

## International Maize and Wheat Improvement Centre (CIMMYT – Mexico)

The International Maize and Wheat Improvement Centre operates in the developing world to improve livelihood

and promote more productive, sustainable maize and wheat farming. The Centre's portfolio targets critical challenges, such as food insecurity and malnutrition, climate change and environmental degradation. Through collaborate research, partnerships, and training, the Centre contributes to the building and strengthening of a new generation of national agricultural research and extension services in maize- and wheat- growing nations. As a member of the CGIAR Research System composed of 15 agriculture research centres, CIMMYT leads the CGIAR Research Program in Maize and Wheat, which is streamlined into the agriculture

development programme of more than 500 partners around the world (CIMMYT information sheet retrieved from <u>www.ciat.cgiar.org/</u>, Nov. 2017).

It all starts with seed. CIMMYT crop-breeding research begins with its Germplasm Bank, consisting of a unique catalogue of genetic diversity comprising over 28,000 unique seed collections of maize and wheat. From the breeding program, CIMMYT sends half a million seed packages to about 600 partners in 100 countries. With the collaboration of researchers and farmers, the Centre also develops and promotes more productive and precise maize and wheat farming methods and tools that help save money and resources such as soil, water, and fertilizer.

## Box 1: FAO "Seed for Development – A bright future for Open-pollinated corn

**FAO 'Seed for Development' Project – A Bright Future for Open-Pollinated Corn** Published on August 1, 2014 in <u>Issue 26</u> of the <u>Belize Ag Report</u>.

Experimental seed development project sponsored by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and carried out by Cayo farmers under the direction of Lead Extension Officer, William Can, of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Agriculture (MNRA), is a resounding success! The project objective was to evaluate and multiply seeds of three improved corn varieties, two of which were white corn and one yellow, that adapted to weather and soil conditions of the Cayo District from the previous year's experiment. The slogan that evolved is *Good seed = Good yield*. The success of the corn seed production trials hinged on a strong support for the plans in training and assisting corn farmers to address their most pressing issues such as:

- Production and selection of quality seeds to increase yields.
- Good agronomic practices to increase yields.
- Good post-harvest practices.
- Marketing.
- New technologies to increase yields per unit area by increasing plant density.
- Good management practices of the crop.
- Formation and organization of corn farmer groups to maximize production success.

Ms. Fay Garnett, District Agriculture Coordinator (Cayo) /Organic Program Coordinator of MNRA indicated that NB-6 seeds should be available to farmers for the next growing season from seed plots in Valley of Peace. The varieties currently planted are: Icta-B1, NB-6, CARDI yc-001.

According to William Can, 12 acres were being planted for seed purposes in the Toledo district. The varieties were Icta-B1, NB-6, CARDI yc-001, one local white and one local yellow. All these varieties were to be harvested and sold as seeds in the Toledo district. More details on the corn trials can be seen in *The Belize Ag Report, Issue 26*.

# **1.2.2 Identification of barriers for heat and drought resistant varieties of corn and beans seeds**

Following consultation with key stakeholders connected with the production of certified grain seeds in the Agriculture sector, a list of general barriers that may likely impede the transfer and diffusion of climate resilient grain seeds were identified. These were:

- Costs to procure and run field trials of breeder seeds;
- Initial cost to purchase certified seeds and to prepare land for planting commercial grain;
- Land tenure issues;
- Lack of a functional Cool Storage facility for harvested grain crop;
- Lack of a workable marketing strategy;
- Lack of interest among some farmers;
- Limited knowledge about the impacts of Climate Change and the need to conserve water, soil, biodiversity, and reduce emissions;
- Lack of finance for maintenance and rehabilitation of cool storage facility;
- Inadequate recurrent budget and institutional support to run 'certified' seed production and training;
- Limited use of climate resilient, certified grain seeds;
- Inadequate financing facilities/mechanism for small farmers;
- Elevated financial risks arising from extreme climatic events and unfavourable market
- Weak coordination and synergy among certified grain producing groups.
- Absence of a National Seed policy;
- No national seed/crop certification mechanism and unit.
- Incumbent technology of non-climate resilient varieties still holds sway some users and larger farmers
- Patented breeder, lines or stock seed limits importation amount and distribution for field testing and reproduction

The list of the main barriers was then short listed in accordance with their degree of importance and rank as illustrated in Table 10 below. Those barriers ranking 1 and 2 on the Likert scale were then further analysed using the LFW methodology of "problem tree" and corresponding "solution tree".

| No. | Barriers        | Criteria and Importance of Barriers for Technology 1 |         |           |           |                |      |
|-----|-----------------|--|---------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------|
|     | Economic &      | 1.   | 2.      | 3.        | 4.        | 5.             |      |
|     | Financial       | Critical (killer,                                    | Crucial | Important | Less      | Insignificant  | Rank |
|     |                 | non-starter)   |         |           | important | (easy starter) |      |
| 1   | Initial costs   |  | Х       |           |           |                | 2    |
|     | for seeds and   |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | field trials    |  |         |           |           |                |      |
| 2   | Cost for        | Х  |         |           |           |                | 1    |
|     | cultivating     |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | certified/      |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | commercial      |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | grains          |  |         |           |           |                |      |
| 3   | Limited low-    |  |         | Х         |           |                |      |
|     | interest        |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | financing       |  |         |           |           |                |      |
| 4   | High taxes      |  |         | Х         |           |                | 3    |
|     | and limited     |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | subsidies       |  |         |           |           |                |      |
| 5   | Unfavourable    |  | Х       |           |           |                | 2    |
|     | market status   |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | at harvest      |  |         |           |           |                |      |
| 6   | Financial risks |  |         | Х         |           |                | 3    |
|     | due crop        |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | failure         |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | Non-financial   |  |         |           |           |                |      |
| 7   | Land tenure     |  |         | х         |           |                | 3    |
|     | issues          |  |         |           |           |                |      |
| 8   | Limited use of  | Х  |         |           |           |                | 1    |
|     | climate         |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | resilient crops |  |         |           |           |                |      |
| 9   | Incumbent       |  | Х       |           |           |                | 2    |
|     | technology in   |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | grain           |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | production      |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | still widely    |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | used            |  |         |           |           |                |      |
| 10  | Absence of a    |  |         | х         |           |                |      |
|     | national seed   |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | policy          |  |         |           |           |                |      |
| 11  | Weak            |  |         |           |           | X              | 5    |
|     | coordination    |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | among           |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | certified grain |  |         |           |           |                |      |

## Table 10: Criteria and importance of barriers for climate resilient grains

|    | producers      |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | Lack of        |   |   | X |   | 4 |
|    | drying and     |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | cool storage   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | facilities     |   |   |   |   |   |
| 13 | Limited        |   |   |   | х | 5 |
|    | quantity of    |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | patented       |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | breeder, lines |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | or stock seeds |   |   |   |   |   |
| 14 | Weak           | Х |   |   |   |   |
|    | institutional  |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | capacity in    |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | extension      |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | services and   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | R&D            |   |   |   |   |   |
| 15 | Mis-trust      |   |   | Х |   | 3 |
|    | among small    |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | farmers in     |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | new            |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | technology     |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | and with       |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | MOA            |   |   |   |   |   |
| 16 | Animosity of   |   |   |   | Х | 4 |
|    | small farmers  |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | towards larger |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | producers      |   |   |   |   |   |
| 17 | Water scarcity |   | Х |   |   | 3 |
|    | during dry     |   |   |   |   |   |
| 10 | season         |   |   |   |   |   |
| 18 | Limited        |   | Х |   |   |   |
|    | knowledge of   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | impacts of     |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | climate        |   |   |   |   |   |
| 10 |                |   |   |   |   | 2 |
| 19 | In effective   | Х |   |   |   | 2 |
|    | strategic plan |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | to build       |   |   |   |   |   |
|    |                |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | resilience in  |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | agriculture    |   |   |   |   |   |

Figure 1 below is a problem tree analysis conducted with stakeholder's input on the barrier or focal problem: "Limited use of climate resilient crops among small farmers".

The causes and effects arising from this focal problem are clearly highlighted in the diagram. Stakeholders have pointed out that this is the reality in the sector and are compatible with the main identified barriers for production and dissemination of climate resilient varieties of open pollinated corn and bean seeds in Belize. The economic barriers are further addressed in the following section.



Figure 1: Problem tree for low cultivation of climate resilient grains among small farmers

Other critical barriers identified from the selection process above in Table 10 were:

- Initial cost for stock seeds and trials.
- Cost to cultivate certified/commercial seeds (by famers).
- Unfavourable market climate at harvest.
- Incumbent technology still widely in use.
- Weak institutional capacity in extension services and R & D.
- In effective strategic plan to build climate resilience in agriculture.

## 2.2.2.1 Economic and financial barriers

According to the literature (Nygaard and Hansen, 2015), one of the main constraints or barrier to the transfer and diffusion of a new or improved technology is the difference in cost of the technology in its development/demonstration phase and the cost of the baseline or incumbent technology, or the absence of the technology. For example, an improved, highly automated drip/fertigation systems being tested and the inefficient, manual drip irrigation in use, or the absence of drip or sprinkler irrigation systems in crop production. In the case of the introduction of climate resilient grains into a farming system, this economic barrier would be the cost of procuring the breeder/lines or stock seed varieties from Grain Research Centres such as CIAT or CIMMTY; doing extensive and controlled field trials, testing for the preferred varieties for climate resilience, robustness and high-yielding, and palatability. The cost also includes inputs and reproduction of the varieties for certified/commercial seed production for sale to farmers as planting material (M. Trujillo, Agronomist and National Crop Coordinator, MOA, personal comm. 14 November, 2017).

Figure 2 and Figure 3, and Table 11 illustrate the economic disparity between the new technology and the baseline (incumbent) for the production of one acre of Yellow Corn and Black/Small Red Beans. This also holds true for improved drip irrigation & fertigation, micro-propagation of climate resilient potato seedlings and for refurbishing crop cover structures with improved, and efficient cooling systems. Detailed cost estimates and monetary benefits for grains, laboratory micro-propagation of climate resilient potato propagules (seed tubers) and drip irrigation can be reviewed in Annex I C.



**Figure 2: Size of economic barrier for climate resilient variety of yellow corn** (After Nygaard and Hansen, 2015)



**Figure 3: Size of economic barrier for new varieties of Black and Small Red beans** (After Nygaard and Hansen, 2015)

## Cost Benefits analysis for cultivation of one and fifteen acres of the incumbent Grains

Table 11 is a summary of the Cost-Benefit analysis for cultivation of one and fifteen hectares of incumbent grain seed at the January, 2017 market price.

Cost of inputs included subsidized seeds at BZ\$ 1.50 per pound. The production cost for the climate resilient seeds is assumed to be double the price per pound of the incumbent seed (Annex 1-B: Grain and Potato Production Statistics, 2010 - 1016), hence the cost for input will be higher (i.e. the cost barrier), but the benefits will be improved yields and better market prices, once the other facilities in the market chain are established and market conditions become favourable for small producers.

| Cost Benefit Analysis for One Hectare of Incumbent Variety of Yellow Corn |                                 |                |             |                          |  |  |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------------|--|--|
|   |                                 | Wholesale      |             |                          |  |  |
| Dry Weight Corn (14%)   | Av. Yield lbs/Ac                | Price/lb       | Total Sales | Remarks                  |  |  |
|   | 2000.00                         | \$ 1.50        | \$ 3,000.00 |                          |  |  |
|   |                                 |                |             |                          |  |  |
| Cost of production from planting to storage                               |                                 |                | \$ 798.00   | From CBA, Annex 1B       |  |  |
| Net Profit  |                                 |                | \$ 2,202.00 |                          |  |  |
|   |                                 |                |             | Projected Sales for 15   |  |  |
| Cost of Producing 15 acres of corn  | Yield for 15 acres of Corn      | Price/lb of co | rn seed     | acres                    |  |  |
|   | 30000                           | \$ 1.50        |             | \$ 45,000.00             |  |  |
| Cost of production for 15 acres @ BZ\$ 798.00                             |                                 |                |             | \$ 11,970.00             |  |  |
| per acre  |                                 |                |             |                          |  |  |
| Net Profit  |                                 |                |             | \$ 33,030.00             |  |  |
|   |                                 |                |             |                          |  |  |
| Cost Benefit An   | alysis Incumbent Varieties of B | lack and Small | Red Beans   |                          |  |  |
|   | Av. Yield lbs/Ac                | Price/lb       | Total       | Remarks                  |  |  |
|   | 1000                            | \$1.50         | \$ 1,500.00 |                          |  |  |
| Cost of production  |                                 |                | \$ 632.25   | From CBA in Annex IB     |  |  |
| Net Profit/acre   |                                 |                | \$ 867.75   |                          |  |  |
|   |                                 |                |             |                          |  |  |
|   |                                 |                |             | Project Sales for 15     |  |  |
|   | Yield lbs for 15 acres of beans | Price/lb       |             | acres                    |  |  |
|   | 15000                           | \$1.50         |             | \$ 22,500.00             |  |  |
|   |                                 |                |             |                          |  |  |
|   | Cost per acre                   | Acres Planted  |             | Total Cost of Production |  |  |
| Cost of Production/acre   | \$632.25                        | 15             |             | \$ 9,483.75              |  |  |
|   |                                 |                |             |                          |  |  |
| Net Profit  |                                 |                |             | 13016.25                 |  |  |

## Table 11: Cost-Benefit Analysis for cultivation of one hectare of yellow corn and beans

(Source: M. Truijillo, Agronomist, MOA, Jan. 2018)

## Decomposition Critical Barriers

Figure 4 show the decomposition of key barriers limiting the transfer and diffusion of new technologies in the agriculture sector. The broad categories were: Economic and financial, market failures, and non-financial barriers. These were decomposed into: barriers identified within categories, elements and dimensions of barriers, as proposed by Nygaard and Hansen (2015). The decomposition of these barriers for the agriculture sector, in particular, helps stakeholders to understand their significance, and provide the baseline for identifying and implement appropriate measures to overcome or reduce the effects of the barriers.

For example: under 'capital cost', one element of this barrier identified by stakeholders was 'high interest rates'; another was 'high import duties on equipment'; and a third was 'high cost of specialized services and programmes'. The corresponding dimensions of these barrier elements under 'capital cost', include: 'interest rates per annum could be 15% or higher for certain processes in the market chain' (e.g. rentals or land taxes); 'high risks of default on loan (depending on assessment of NPV, IRR, and/or payback period, etc.), and 'high transaction cost for technology transfer/diffusion' (e.g. could be as high as US\$ 2,500, depending on the size of the loan). Measures to address the latter can then be proposed and implemented to counter the economic barriers.



Figure 4: Decomposition of key barriers to the diffusion of technologies in Agriculture

In small economies of many developing countries, most of these 'critical, or non-starter' barriers are cross-cutting for most or all sectors vulnerable to the negative impacts of climate change. Actors sometimes operate in more than one sector or sub-sector, such as: Agriculture; Water Resource; the Coastal Zone and Marine Ecosystem; Aqua-culture; and Land Use, Land use Change and Agro-forestry. This is the case in the Greater Belize River watershed, that drains the central region of the country, and where rapid and poorly planned development is on the rise (e.g. the period 2012-2018), such as in agriculture and tourism, are occurring, and impacting the marine environment (Boles, E. in CZMAI, 2014). Hence, policies and regulations for sustainable use of resources and planned development, become barriers for technology transfer, when not implemented properly or stakeholders do not comply, or where policies/regulations become ineffective, or outdated, or do not exist.

## 2.2.3 Identified measures

Figure 5 is the Objective tree analysis of the focal problem identified earlier by the small group of stakeholders, centred on the objective: "Extensive use of climate resilient crops among small farmers". One option for a strategic pathway of measures and results to attain the said objective is contained in the green-shaded boxes in the diagram. This option for a solution of the problem and attainment of the objective is further developed in Table 12.



Figure 5: Objective tree for cultivation of climate resilient grains among small farm

| Table 12: Proposed strategic pathway for objective – 'Extensive use of climate resilient |
|--|
| crops/grains among small farmers'  |

| Objective   | Measures   | Results  | Timeframe &   |
|---|--|--|---|
|   |  |  | Actors  |
| Extensive use of<br>climate resilient<br>crops/grains<br>among small<br>farmers | Crop Development<br>Unit (MOA) and<br>Farmers groups will<br>ensure that climate<br>resilient certified seeds<br>& other inputs will be<br>available, Finance for<br>this measures will<br>come from capital<br>costs. | Positive perception of<br>climate resilient, open-<br>pollinated corn and<br>beans varieties among<br>farmers. Food<br>insecurity reduced. | *Medium term.<br>- MOA, specialized<br>grain/crop seed<br>importers |
|   | Wholesalers & MOA<br>will keep in cool   | Stable/high crop yields and more income for  | *Medium/long term.<br>- Importers /                                 |

|   |                           | 11/ 11 1                 |                        |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
|   | storage, adequate         | small/medium-size        | wholesalers. MOA       |
|   | inventory of certified    | farmers.                 | grain prediction Unit  |
|   | seeds, as seed market     |                          |                        |
|   | grows.                    |                          |                        |
|   | MOA will implement        | Traditional open-        | Medium/long term       |
|   | and coordinate            | pollinated varieties     | - MOA Extension        |
|   | efficient & effective     | preferred over hybrid.   | Service, policymakers  |
|   | technology diffusion      | Technical capacity of    | & administrators       |
|   | programme and             | farmers improved.        |                        |
|   | Extension Service.        |                          |                        |
| - | Through technology        | Farmers need not         | Medium/long term       |
|   | diffusion programme,      | purchase seeds           | - Extension service    |
|   | MOA will build trust      | annually, some           | ΜΟΑ                    |
|   | for technology among      | harvested grain seed     |                        |
|   | small and medium-         | used for planting.       |                        |
|   | scale farmers.            | r8.                      |                        |
|   | Policy Unit and           | Lower costs for          | Medium/long term       |
|   | partners will advocate    | 'certified' seeds: lower | • MOA and private      |
|   | for lower import duties   | losses higher vields:    | - WOA and private      |
|   | and taxes for Breeder     | increased income for     | sector stakenoiders    |
|   | seeds and equipment       | farmers                  |                        |
|   | (e.g. for grain storage   | Tarmers.                 |                        |
|   | (e.g. for grain storage,  |                          |                        |
|   | spares/components,        |                          |                        |
|   | innuta)                   |                          |                        |
| - | inputs).                  | 0. 1. 1 1                | M                      |
|   | I raining/capacity        | Stimulate local          | Medium term            |
|   | building and              | economy.                 | - MOA CRDU, FCPU,      |
|   | demonstrations for        |                          | CARDI, & others        |
|   | Registered and            |                          |                        |
|   | Certified seed-           |                          |                        |
|   | producers will be         |                          |                        |
|   | conducted and             |                          |                        |
|   | financed through          |                          |                        |
|   | capital costs.            |                          |                        |
|   | Procure and erect at      | Marketing of grains      | *Short/medium/long     |
|   | least 2-cool storage      | controlled. Farmers      | term.                  |
|   | facilities for registered | can sell when prices     | - MOA; private sector  |
|   | and certified grain-      | are good.                |                        |
|   | seed storage, financed    |                          |                        |
|   | through capital costs.    |                          |                        |
|   | Establish effective       | Increased yields, jobs,  | Medium/long term.      |
|   | maintenance and           | food security and        | - MOA & Certified seed |
|   | management                | livelihood;              | producers including    |
|   | programme for breeder     |                          | CARDI                  |
|   | grain seed production     |                          |                        |
|   | chain during early        |                          |                        |
|   | phase of project          |                          |                        |
|   | 1                         |                          |                        |

| (MOA & Certified        |                         |                    |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| seed producers). This   |                         |                    |
| will be financed        |                         |                    |
| through operational     |                         |                    |
| costs.                  |                         |                    |
| High-level training     | More progressive,       | Medium/long term.  |
| and capacity building   | business-oriented and   | - MOA Extension    |
| programme through       | environmentally-        | Service, CARDI,    |
| MOA CRDU will be        | sensitive farming       | Manufacturers      |
| conducted for certified | communities.            |                    |
| seed producers and      | Increased resiliency    |                    |
| small/medium-scale      | and climate smart       |                    |
| farmers                 | agriculture.            |                    |
| Upgrade MOA             | -Farmers understand     | Medium/long term.  |
| commodity and           | market, have some       | - MOA Policy Unit, |
| production database,    | control of market       | Extension Service, |
| and market              | prices, and have good   | Partners.          |
| information which will  | returns on investments  |                    |
| be available to         | -Farmers reuse land,    |                    |
| producers /             | improve soil fertility  |                    |
| policymakers, &         | and reduced impacts     |                    |
| others. Capital finance | of extreme climate      |                    |
| will cover this         |                         |                    |
| measure                 |                         |                    |
| Through other           | -Stemmed foreign        | Medium/long term.  |
| intervention MOA will   | exchange loss &         | - MOA CRDU, FCPU,  |
| step up 'added value'   | reduce food insecurity; | Partners           |
| and marketing training  | -Stimulate local        |                    |
| to produce, thereby     | economy                 |                    |
| expanding commodity     |                         |                    |
| (grain production) and  |                         |                    |
| reduced imports.        |                         |                    |

\*Short term: Within one year; Medium term: Within three to five years; Long term > five years

## Using Cost-Benefit model results to assess measures on diffusion of improved Yellow Corn Seeds

Table 13 is a summary of the Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) model results to evaluate some recommended measures to facilitate the diffusion of climate change adaptation technologies in agriculture. The technologies include the procurement and production of climate resilient Yellow Corn seeds, production of Black and Small Red Beans seeds, and production of micro-propagated climate resilient Irish potato, certified seed-tubers.

| i contene gi anto an    | resident gruins and rotato seed tubers |      |                          |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------|--|------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Products                | 10-year                                | NPV  | Benefits-increased       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Discount                               |      | Production (1000 tonnes) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Rate                                   |      |                          |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yellow Corn             | 10%                                    | 31.3 | 86.1                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black & Small Red Beans | 10%                                    | 31.2 | 14.0                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Climate Resilient Irish | 10%                                    | 31.0 | 76.0                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Potato seeds            |  |      |                          |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

 Table 13: Cost-benefit results to assess measures for diffusion of climate resilient grains and Potato seed-tubers

The measures considered in the CBA included: Subsidy on seeds per hectare, Introduction Package, Awareness Campaign, and Programme Administration. The model outputs are contained in Annex I-D. The results showed Net Present Value (NPV) increased gain on investment in a 10-year period, assuming 10 % discount rate, which could be lower during the period under consideration. The results show that the investments are viable. Table 14 and Figure 6 show the CBA model output results for various measures related to the production of Yellow Corn with baseline and programmed improved seed variety. As indicated above, similar results and plots are contained in Annex I-D for reference.

 Table 14: Assessing sets of measures for improved corn seed production

| Assessing sets of measures for improv | ed maize seeds  |                |          |          |           | INPUT CEI  | LS IN YELLO | w      |        |        |          |         |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------|----------|-----------|------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|----------|---------|
| Assumptions                           | Increased yield |                | 3.86     | tonne/ha |           | Disc. rate |             | 0.1    |        |        |          |         |
|                                       |                 |                |          |          |           |            |             |        |        |        |          |         |
| Text                                  | Unit            | Total 10 years | year 1   | year 2   | year 3    | year 4     | year 5      | year 6 | year 7 | year 8 | year 9   | year 10 |
| Impact                                |                 |                |          |          |           |            |             |        |        |        |          |         |
| ha with improved (baseline)           | 1000            | 22.3           | 1        | 1.1      | 1.2       | 1.3        | 1.4         | 1.5    | 2.8    | 3      | 4        | 5       |
| ha with improved (programme)          | 1000            | 44.6           | 2        | 2.2      | 2.4       | 2.6        | 2.8         | 3      | 5.6    | 6      | 8        | 10      |
| Effect (ha with improved seeds)       | 1000            | 22.3           | 1        | 1.1      | 1.2       | 1.3        | 1.4         | 1.5    | 2.8    | 3      | 4        | 5       |
| Programme costs                       |                 | NPV            |          |          |           |            |             |        |        |        |          |         |
| Subsidty on seeds per ha              | USD             |                | 30       | 30       | 25        | 20         | 20          | 20     | 10     | 5      | 0        | 0       |
| Subsidy on seeds                      | M USD           | 0.3            | 0.06     | 0.066    | 0.06      | 0.052      | 0.056       | 0.06   | 0.056  | 0.03   | 0        | 0       |
| Introduction package                  | M USD           | 24.5           | 27       | 0        | 0         | 0          | 0           | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0        | 0       |
| Awareness campaign                    | M USD           | 3.8            | 1        | 1        | 1         | . 1        | 1           | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0        | 0       |
| to be specified                       |                 |                |          |          |           |            |             |        |        |        |          |         |
| Program administration                | M USD           | 2.7            | 0.5      | 0.5      | 0.5       | 0.5        | 0.5         | 0.5    | 0.5    | 0.5    | 0        | 0       |
| Total programme cost (NPV)            | M USD           | 31.3           | 28.56    | 1.566    | 1.56      | 1.552      | 1.556       | 0.56   | 0.556  | 0.53   | 0        | 0       |
|                                       |                 |                |          |          |           |            |             |        |        |        |          |         |
| Benefits                              | 1000            |                |          |          |           |            |             |        |        |        |          |         |
| Increased production                  | tonnes          | 86.1           | 3.86     | 4.246    | 4.632     | 5.018      | 5.404       | 5.79   | 10.808 | 11.58  | 15.44    | 19.3    |
| Cost vs. benefits                     |                 |                |          |          |           |            |             |        |        |        |          |         |
| Programme costs/tonne of extra yield  |                 | 363.7          | USD/tonn | e maíze  | Market pr | ice for ma | ize         |        |        | 110    | USD/tonn | e       |

(After Nygaard and Hansen, 2015)



Figure 6: CBA model results plots for measures related to Yellow Corn seed production

Table 15 is a summary of critical and significant barriers and related measures for the diffusion of climate resilient varieties of grain seeds for: Economic and financial category of barriers; Market conditions; Legal and regulatory framework; Network Structures; and Others. The summary also highlights if the measures/interventions are Legal or Other, and if probable funding sources can be procured in-country or from external sources.

| Categories | Identified Barriers | Barriers Measures to overcome  |              | ention       | Funding Sources |              |
|------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
|            |                     | barriers                       |              |              |                 |              |
|            |                     |                                | Legal        | Other        | National        | External     |
|            |                     | -Expand and secure access      |              |              |                 |              |
| Economic   | – High initial      | to finance (Grants, low        |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$    | $\checkmark$ |
|            | investment          | interest loans, project funds) |              |              |                 |              |
|            | - Limited subsidies | -Lobby for reduced import      |              |              |                 |              |
| and        | for technology      | Tax on equipment and seeds     | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$    |              |
| financial  | components          |                                |              |              |                 |              |
| manciai    | - High cost of      | -Provide technology            |              |              |                 |              |
|            | installation        | companies & suppliers with     |              | N            |                 | 2            |
|            |                     | concession to service          |              | v            |                 | v            |
|            |                     | specific areas or groups of    |              |              |                 |              |

Table 15: Summary of market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures for improved varieties of grain seeds

|            |                                      | clients at reduced service    |              |              |              |              |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|            |                                      | costs (e.g. Public-private    |              |              |              |              |
|            |                                      | partnership)                  |              |              |              |              |
|            |                                      | – Set up local assembling     |              | 1            | 1            |              |
|            | - Gaps in technology                 | industry (small industry,     |              |              |              |              |
|            | value chain                          | job creation initiative etc.) |              |              |              |              |
|            | – Local hardware                     | – Improve access to           |              |              |              |              |
| Market     | stores often low in                  | products and services.        |              |              |              |              |
| conditions | stocks of spares &                   | Grow the market for new       |              | ,            | •            | ,            |
|            | components                           | technology                    |              |              |              |              |
|            | – Unstable,                          | - Implement policies &        |              |              |              |              |
|            | monopoly, special                    | regulations for favourable    |              |              |              |              |
|            | interest groups                      | market climate to help level  |              |              |              |              |
|            | <b>.</b>                             | playing field                 |              |              |              |              |
|            | - Inadequate policy                  | – Improve policy and          |              |              |              |              |
|            | and regulatory                       | enabling environment (e.g.    |              |              |              |              |
|            | framework                            | seed policy, market           | $\checkmark$ |              |              |              |
|            |                                      | liberalisation,               |              |              |              |              |
|            |                                      | protectionism, monopoly       |              |              |              |              |
| Legal and  |                                      | of incumbent technology)      |              |              |              |              |
| regulatory | - No office of testing               | – Establish regulatory        |              |              |              |              |
| 6 7        | and certification                    | agency for standards,         |              |              |              |              |
|            |                                      | testing and certification     |              |              |              |              |
|            |                                      | (for equipment, seeds, etc.)  |              |              |              |              |
|            | – Import of cheaper,                 | - Strengthen regulatory       |              |              |              |              |
|            | inferior-quality                     | framework (e.g.               |              |              |              |              |
|            | equipment/products                   | implementation & penalty)     |              |              |              |              |
|            | <ul> <li>Networking among</li> </ul> | – Enhance networking for      |              |              |              |              |
|            | professionals and                    | certified seed production/    |              |              |              |              |
|            | agencies weak and                    | improved drip irrigation /    |              |              |              |              |
|            | ineffective                          | potato cultivation chain      |              | ,            |              |              |
|            |                                      | actors.                       |              |              |              |              |
|            |                                      | - Strengthen research,        |              |              |              |              |
|            |                                      | development and               |              |              |              |              |
| Network    |                                      | demonstration of new          |              |              |              |              |
| structures |                                      | technology                    |              |              |              |              |
| Structures | – Farmers                            | - Strengthen Cooperative      |              |              |              |              |
|            | cooperatives                         | Department and form an        | ,            |              | ,            |              |
|            | generally work in                    | association of farmer's       |              |              |              |              |
|            | insolation (crop                     | cooperatives                  |              |              |              |              |
|            | specific)                            |                               |              |              |              |              |
|            |                                      | - Increase local and          |              | ,            | ,            | ,            |
|            | - Limited farmer to                  | regional farmer's             |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
|            | farmer visits                        | networking                    |              |              |              |              |
| Others     | - Limited awareness                  | – Establish management        |              |              |              |              |
| Outers     | and knowledge of                     | programme and                 |              | •            |              | ¥            |

| new technology       | education/awareness          |    |   |
|----------------------|------------------------------|----|---|
|                      | campaign among key           |    |   |
|                      | stakeholders for new         |    |   |
|                      | technology                   |    |   |
| -Low technical       | - Establish effective and    |    |   |
| capacity             | on-going training            | al | 2 |
|                      | component in technology      | V  | N |
|                      | diffusion programme          |    |   |
| -Farming             | – Through technology         |    |   |
| communities and      | diffusion programme          |    |   |
| farmers suspicious   | address social, cultural and | 2  | 2 |
| and afraid of change | behavioural issues;          | v  | N |
|                      | improve KAP* among           |    |   |
|                      | users of new technologies    |    |   |

(\* KAP: Knowledge, Attitude and Perception)

## 2.2.3.1 Economic and financial measures

Economic and financial measures for the transfer of climate resilient, open-pollinated varieties of corn and beans 'certified' seeds as noted by stakeholders during deliberation of barriers and related measures are summarised in Table 15 above and include:

- Expand access to finance.
- Lobby for reduced import duties/tax on equipment and seeds.
- Provide technology companies & suppliers with concession to service specific areas or groups of clients at reduced service costs (Public-private partnership).
- Technology transfer programmed should consider capacity development in "value added' for producers and beneficiaries, and market evaluation, iderntifying market opportunities and niche markets.

Box 2 is an overview of specific measures or actions related to the economic measures outlined above that can be considered by partner in the technology transfer and diffusion. The key actors enabling these measures/actions include: The Fruit Tree and Crop Development Unit in the Ministry of Agriculture, CARDI, BAHA, Grain Seed Production Cooperatives, and farmers willing to participate.

## Box 2: Specific actions related to the economic measures for the transfer and diffusion of climate resilient grain seed production and dissemination

- Procurement of capital funds to purchase at least two, well-equipped cool storage facilities running on RE energy with diesel generator backup or grid connection.
- Request from GOB/Farmers cooperatives an adequate recurrent budget for maintenance and operation initially.
- Develop an effective Business Plan to market locally produced 'certified' grain seeds for local and regional markets.
- Facilitate low-interest loans for farmers for grain production from DFC, the National Bank, Credit Unions, and other local /regional, financial institutions.
- Conduct a feasibility study for establishing a "Multi-peril Crop Insurance" programme to cover the widest range of risks that impacts farmers, including grain-producers.
- Develop a marketing programme for promulgating 'value added' for local produce, grain production, etc.
- Establish a revolving fund/subsidy for Research and Development to be instituted among key crop research agencies such as MOA's Crop Research & Development Unit, Fruit-trees and Crop Development Unit, CARDI, the University of Belize, the Mennonite Community, Seed Production Cooperatives, and others. Initial 'seed money' will be procured through a grant or soft loan of US\$ 40,000.00 from local or international donor agencies.

## 2.2.3.2 Non-financial measures

Non-financial measures for the transfer of climate resilient, open-pollinated varieties of corn and beans 'certified' seeds as discussed and prioritized by stakeholders during deliberation of barriers and related measures are also summarised in Table 15 above and include:

- GOB through Ministry of Trade and Industry, MOA, other strategic line ministries and partners will enhance the legal and economic framework to continue to grow the market for high-demand agriculture produce and new technologies.
- Where necessary, GOB through MOA and Partners will conduct policy & regulation reviews for favourable market environment (e.g. seed policy, market liberalisation, protectionism, monopoly of incumbent technology, water resource management, risk management, etc.), and Strenghten regulatory framework (e.g. implementation & penalty).
- GOB through MOA and the Bureau of Standards will procure necessary resources and human capacity to establish a regulatory agency for standards, testing and certification (equipment, seeds, etc.)
- Capital cost for intervention will cover programme to strengthen research, development and demonstration of new technology through the CRDU (Agriculture Innovation Centre).

- Through capital cost of the proposed intervention, MOA will establish management programme and education/awareness campaign among key stakeholders for facilitating diffusion of improved technology.
- MOA will address social, cultural and behavioural issues; improve KAP among stakeholders through technology diffusion programme.

Similar *cross-cutting* measures are applicable for other technologies in the Agriculture and Water Sectors.

Box 3 is an overview of specific measures or actions related to non-financial measures outlined above that can be considered by partner in the technology transfer and diffusion.

## Box 3: Specific actions related to non-financial measures for the transfer and diffusion of climate resilient grain seed production and dissemination

- Farmers must be encouraged to return to open-pollinated varieties of grains, instead of the continued use of expensive, hybrid varieties that have some good traits, but are not sustainable and ecologically friendly. The justification is that even though hybrids are generally high yielding, the inputs can be high, and they are not environmentally friendly and climate resilient.
- Extension Service will train farmers in their own language, about the ecological and financial benefits of Climate Smart Agriculture. (A current intervention being implemented for the Agriculture Sector by the MOA/World Bank/Partners).
- Build trust among small farmers on the far-reaching benefits of climate resilient varieties of corn and bean seeds.
- Upgrade and expand agricultural R&D. Limited capacity, lack of opportunities and an adequate budget-line stifles R&D in the Agriculture Sector in Belize.
- Strengthen partnership among crop research agencies and promulgate farmer-to-farmer exchange programme for related technologies such as improved drip irrigation systems, micro-propagation of potato seed tubers and potato cultivation, and improving designs of crop cover structures for pest control and optimizing yields.

# **2.3 Barrier analysis and possible enabling measures for improved drip irrigation** / fertigation systems

The Agriculture Research and Development Unit (Research, Development and Innovation Centre) in the MOA will spearhead the proposed "Improved drip irrigation systems for crop water requirement, fertigation and water harvesting for five small farming groups" and "Refurbish Seven Covered Structure Cooling Systems". The CRDU provides services and training to farmers in drip and sprinkler irrigation systems and cover structure installation. The

proposed, improved drip irrigation/fertigation systems for cultivation under crop covered structures and small open field plots, will integrate water harvesting and fertigation technology. One major constraints with crop covered structure technology in Belize is the elevated temperatures that develop in these greenhouses during long, hot, sunny days in tropical climate, which limits the number of working hours inside the cover Structures (Oscar Salazar, CRDU Central Farm, personal comm. June 2017).

The justifications cited for expanded use of irrigation technology, such as improved drip irrigation is: water use efficiency, reduction of climate footprint, and addressing high initial cost. Farmers can expect reduced cost of production in the medium and long term, and improved pastures for livestock production in the long term. Increased use of drip irrigation for crop production is a national priority (GOB/FAO, 2011; GOB/FAO, 2015); and is a recommended climate change adaptation technology to reduce stress on water resources, soil and forest resources. Some limiting factors include: initial cost per unit for drip/sprinkler irrigation systems; water availability and reliability during the dry season; maintenance costs; availability of spares; energy source for water pumps; import duties on spares; limited; technical capacity of farmers; and inability of most small famers to finance the capital cost for procurement and installation of an improved, drip irrigation/fertigation system.

Farmers, manufacturers of irrigation equipment, importers and retailers of irrigation systems, and policymakers should understand the conditions under which a specific technology, such as drip irrigation, is desirable and likely to be adopted, as well as externalities that may affect its diffusion. Understanding the adoption patterns of improved drip irrigation technology is critical for the formulation of water, energy, and land management policies (Shrestha and Gopalakrishhnm, 1993). Additionally, it is not sufficient to know whether drip irrigation is likely to be adopted in a particular field; but equally important is the ability to determine to what extent the technology will be effectively utilized, pending on other factors, such as availability of spares, operational costs, reliable market(s) for produce, ability to pay back, risk transfer mechanisms, sufficient water for irrigation, needs of other water users, among other factors.

## 2.3.1 General description of improved drip irrigation/fertigation systems

The proposed improved irrigation technology intervention is intended to support the work of the MOA's Crop Research and Development Unit (CRDU) field station in Belmopan, and five district agriculture training/demonstration sub-stations in Belize. The improved drip irrigation/rainwater harvesting & fertigation technology proposed for training and demonstration, will target small farmer's groups/cooperatives engaged in vegetable and horticulture cultivation under cover structure, which is practiced by farmers in all six districts. Six improved drip irrigation/water harvesting & fertigation systems are being considered for

this adaptation technology transfer; and shall be coordinated, managed and maintained by the CRDU and Extension Services of the Ministry of Agriculture.

## Improved drip irrigation system

Improved drip irrigation introduce water directly into the root zone without sprinkling the foliage or wetting the entire soil surface. Such partial-area irrigation methods offer the additional benefit of keeping the greater part of the soil surface (between the rows of crop plants) dry. This discourages the growth of weeds, that would otherwise not only compete with crop plants for nutrients and moisture in the root zone and for light above ground, but also hinder field operations and the control of pests (Perry, 2015). This technology can be used in conjunction with other climate change adaptation measures such as water harvesting, multi-cropping and fertilizer management (fertigation system). Promoting drip irrigation contributes to efficient water use, reduce requirements for broadcasting fertilizers, control weeds, and increases soil productivity. It is particularly suitable in areas with permanent or seasonal water scarcity, since crop varieties planted can adapt to the local conditions.

Investment is required to build worker's capacity in order to efficiently maintain the system and water flow control. Drip irrigation can be used for small or large-scale crop production, and with low cost or more sophisticated components.

How the system is operated is very important. With poor management, even the most sophisticated system can result in water loss and inefficiency. Only knowledgeable, experienced and caring management can ensure that appropriate irrigation systems achieve their full potential benefits. Table 14 is a summary of applied irrigation as per agriculture productive system in Belize (Chung, 2011 in GOB/CDB/FAO, 2015). Except for wetland (flood) irrigated rice and drip irrigated banana, the percent of total cultivated area with applied irrigation is small for most other crops.

| Agriculture Water Management (AWM) Baseline in Belize 2011 |                  |                    |           |         |             |              |              |        |        |
|--|------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------|--------|
|  | High Value Crops |                    |           |         | Field Crops |              |              |        |        |
|  |                  | Production Systems |           |         |             |              |              |        |        |
|  | Banana           | Citrus             | Sugarcane | Aboreal | Other       | Dryland Rice | Wetland Rice | Corn   | Pulses |
| AWM Total ha.  | 2,493            | 19,000             | 28,000    | 2,152   | 1,205       | 3,183        | 760          | 17,398 | 9,273  |
| Details % irrigated  | 85               | <1                 | <1        | < 45    | 20          | <1           | 100          | <1     | < 3    |

 Table 16: Percent applied irrigation per productive system in Belize in 2011.

(Source: Chung, 2011 in GOB/CDB/FAO, 2015)

In 2015 some 5,427 acres (2196.2 ha) of rice was cultivated with flood irrigation mostly in the Orange Walk District. Less than 50 % of the potato crop (107 acres) were cultivated under drip irrigation, mostly in northern Belize (Mr. Jonathan Can, Extension Officer, MOA, personal communication, April 2016).

Two major type of cropping systems in Belize are mono-cropping and mixed-cropping (Chung, 2011). Mono-cropping is done usually by medium to large farmers, where their produce is export oriented. Most of the mono-crops are citrus, banana, sugarcane, papaya and rice. Mixed-cropping, as expected is done mostly by small farmers, where most of their produce is consumed locally. Some examples are tomatoes, onions, sweet pepper, broccoli and melons. Corn and grain legumes or pulses (beans), and tubers (such as Irish Potato and Sweet Potato) cultivation is mostly rainfed.

The improved drip irrigation systems will be installed at five farming cooperative farming sites, and one at the Ministry of Agriculture field stations at the Agriculture Showgrounds training station in Belmopan, Cayo District.

The target farming groups for the proposed advanced drip irrigation systems installation and initial training will be:

- 1. The Valley of Peace Vegetable producers (mixed cropping under cover structure and small open fields (Improved drip irrigation);
- 2. The San Carlos New River Cooperative consisting of 26 members, engaged in the cultivation of corn, bean, onions and vegetables (Improved irrigation system).
- 3. San Antonio Farmers cooperative engaged in the cultivation of potato, black bean, peanuts and vegetables (Improved drip irrigation).
- 4. Red Bank Village Farmers Cooperative, and
- 5. Silver Creek Farmers Cooperative (Improved drip irrigation)

The Ministry of Agriculture's Agricultural Water Management Investment Plan, Volume 1. Final Report (2015) calls for "cost effective irrigated agriculture contributing to sustainable food security, poverty alleviation and economic growth", and "An irrigated agricultural sector provided with adequate and appropriate irrigation infrastructure" (GOB/FAO/CDB. 2015). Note that the "Target" and the degree of the intervention, that is: "Too Ambitious" or "Conservative" is summarized in Table 7 above.

Box 4 is a summary of the proceedings from a Climate Change and Agriculture Forum held in February, 2016, where partners in the Agriculture Sector deliberated on the impacts of climate change on agricultural operations and production. A series of adaptation measures or actions were recommended for increasing frequency of excessive rainfall and floods, droughts, and climate variability/seasonal changes in rainfall pattern, and temperature increase.

Some of the measures/actions proposed for droughts, climate variability and temperature increase relevant to technology transfer in the Agriculture Sector included: drip irrigation; increased use of renewable energy; selection of heat-tolerant crops, pasture varieties and livestock breeds, with emphasis on indigenous genetic diversity; and heat-alleviating

infrastructure or appropriately ventilated housing designs for poultry, pigs, sheep and goats, and crop cover structures.

## **Box 4: Climate change impacts on Agriculture: Summary of proceedings from the February, 2016 Forum**

## **Climate Change Impact on Agriculture**

Published on May 10, 2016 in Issue 32 by D. Feucht, Belize Ag Report

Adaptation measures to climate change and variability were the focus of a forum in February, 2016 when the stakeholders of the agriculture sector and livestock producers met with representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forest, Fisheries, the Environment and Sustainable Development (MAFFESD); Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA); and National Climate Change Office (NCCO).

The measures recommended included:

| For excessive rainfall and flooding                                   | For recurrent droughts                         | For climate variability and temperature increase  |
|---|--|---|
| - Drainage infrastructure,<br>systems and mechanisms                  | - Irrigation, including drip<br>irrigation     | - Seasonal production   |
| - Well-designed and drained road infrastructure                       | - Use of renewable energy sources              | - Timely, specific, and localized weather forecasts   |
| - Available rainfall forecasts  | - Watershed management                         | - Selection of heat-tolerant crops,<br>pasture varieties and livestock<br>breeds with emphasis on<br>indigenous genetic diversity                     |
| - Relocation of animals and annual crops                              | -Water harvesting and storage                  | - Irrigation to alleviate heat stress on plants   |
| - Risk reduction measures &<br>risk transfer mechanism for<br>farmers | - Promote climate-resilient pasture management | -Agro-Silvo-pastoral systems  |
|   |  | - Heat alleviating infrastructure or<br>appropriately ventilated housing<br>designs for poultry, pigs, sheep and<br>goats, and crop cover structures. |

## 2.3.2 Identification of barriers for improved drip irrigation/fertigation systems

The Sector-base Technology Working Group (STWG) met on several occasions to review and evaluate the main barriers for the smooth transfer and diffusion of improved drip irrigation/fertigation technology. The list of barriers presented and analysed in random order included:

- Lack of technical capacity among small farmers and a majority of medium-scale farmers.
- Limited availability of favourable market for producers, especially for small farmers.
- Lack of insurance or crop risk transfer mechanism for losses arising from climate extremes (flood, droughts and fires), praedial larceny, vandalism, etc.
- Non-reliability of water for irrigation during dry season\*.
- Energy to run water pump to get water into the irrigation system. (Most localities will require some sort of solar power or other form of Renewable Energy, or a small capacity diesel generator e.g. 4 Hp).
- Extension Service limited in Personnel/Farmer ratio, and human technical capacity.
- Difficulty exist in organizing, attracting and training farmers.
- High initial cost of establishing an improved irrigation system.
- Low stocks and elevated cost of spares.
- Import duties and taxes for components of irrigation systems, fertigation and water harvesting are relatively high. The costs are passed down to clients.
- Limited subsidies and incentives.
- Access to low-interest finance and reasonable payment plans for small farmers not always available.
- Frustrating land tenure issues.
- A large proportion of younger folks not interested in agriculture.
- Constraints on drip irrigation market due to economies of scale.
- Costs of fuel and lubricants rising.
- Transportation costs also rising.

\* Water sources: Surface water catchments, rivers and streams, rainwater catchment, ponds, reservoirs, elevated tanks or springs/other ground water sources.

## Selection and decomposition of critical barriers for diffusion of improved drip irrigation

The short-list of barriers and the decomposition of "killer" or non-starters are summarised in Table 17. The decomposition of killer barriers is based on the more detailed decomposition of such agriculture technology diffusion barriers presented in Figure 4 above.

## Table 17: Criteria and Importance of Barriers for improved drip irrigation and fertigation

| No. | Barriers             | Criteria      | Criteria and Importance of Barriers for improved drip irrigation |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |
|-----|----------------------|---------------|--|-----------|-----------|----------------|------|--|--|--|
|     | Economic &           | 1. Critical   | . Critical 2. 3. 4. 5.   |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |
|     | Financial            | (killer, non- | Crucial  | Important | Less      | Insignificant  | Rank |  |  |  |
|     |                      | starter)      |  |           | important | (easy starter) |      |  |  |  |
| 1   | - High Initial costs | Х             |  |           |           |                | 1    |  |  |  |
|     | for irrigation       |               |  |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |
|     | systems & setup      |               |  |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |
| 2  | - Credits and        |   | Х |   |   | 1     |
|----|----------------------|---|---|---|---|-------|
|    | limited low-         |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | interest financing,  |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | and unfavourable     |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | payment plans        |   |   |   |   |       |
| 3  | - High import taxes  |   | Х |   |   | 2     |
|    | and limited          |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | subsidies            |   |   |   |   |       |
| 4  | - Unfavourable       | Х |   |   |   | 3     |
|    | market status at     |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | harvest discourage   |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | farmers to invest    |   |   |   |   |       |
| 5  | - Elevated financial |   | Х |   |   | 2     |
|    | risks due to crop    |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | failure              |   |   |   |   |       |
| 6  | - Lack of risks      |   |   | Х |   | 3     |
|    | transfer             |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | mechanism            |   |   |   |   |       |
| 7  | - Foreign exchange   |   |   |   | X | 4     |
|    | and corresponding    |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | banking issues       |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | Non-financial        |   |   |   |   |       |
| 7  | - Frustrating land   |   |   | Х |   | 3     |
|    | tenure issues        |   |   |   |   |       |
| 8  | - Limited use of     | х |   |   |   | 1     |
|    | drip irrigation      |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | byfarmers            |   |   |   |   |       |
| 9  | - Limited subsidies  |   | Х |   |   | 2     |
|    | and incentives       |   |   |   |   |       |
| 10 | - Constraints on     |   | Х |   |   | 2     |
|    | drip irrigation      |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | market due to local  |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | economies-of-        |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | scale.               |   |   |   |   |       |
| 11 | - Extension Service  |   | Х |   |   | 2     |
|    | limited in technical |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | capacity             |   |   |   |   |       |
| 12 | - Limited technical  |   |   | Х |   | <br>3 |
|    | capacity among       |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | small farmers        |   |   |   |   |       |
| 13 | - Rising fuel costs  |   | Х |   |   | 2     |
| 14 | - Rising costs of    |   |   | Х |   | 3     |
|    | transportation       |   |   |   |   |       |

Table 18 is a summary of the 'Critical' (killer or non-starter) and 'Crucial' barriers by category, as selected with a Likert scale, with 1 scored as 'Critical' and 5 'Insignificant' (easy starter).

| Category of             | 1. Critical (killer.   | 2 Crucial  | Elements of killer   | Dimension of  |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Barriers                | non-starter)   | 2. Cruciar   | or non-starters  | barrier elements  |
|                         | Ilish Initial agents   | Caralita and limited   | UI non-starters  |   |
| Economic &<br>Financial | - High Initial costs<br>for irrigation<br>systems                                | <ul> <li>Credits and limited<br/>low-interest<br/>financing facilities<br/>not too attractive for<br/>small farmers</li> <li>High import taxes<br/>and limited subsidies<br/>for irrigation<br/>components/spares</li> <li>Elevated financial<br/>risks due to crop<br/>failure</li> <li>Rising fuel prices</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>High interest rates</li> <li>High import duties<br/>of components</li> <li>Elevated cost of<br/>specialized<br/>services</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>12 – 15 % on certain components</li> <li>Service cost could be as high as 15 % of capital cost</li> <li>Interest rates could be 6 to 12 % per annum</li> </ul>   |
|                         |  |  |  |   |
| Market<br>failures      | - Unfavourable<br>market status at<br>harvest<br>discourage<br>farmers to invest | - Constraints on drip<br>irrigation market due<br>to local economies of<br>scale.  | <ul> <li>Unstable markets</li> <li>Incumbent and<br/>monopoly have<br/>greater slice of<br/>market</li> <li>Supply greater<br/>than demands</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Market policy<br/>and strategy not<br/>clear ad focus</li> <li>Middleman<br/>strongly<br/>influence prices,<br/>returns for<br/>producers often<br/>not equitable</li> <li>Imports,<br/>contraband and<br/>monopoly skew<br/>market against<br/>local producers</li> </ul> |
|                         |  |  |  |   |
| Non-<br>financial       | - Limited use of<br>drip irrigation by<br>farmers                                | <ul> <li>Limited subsidies and<br/>incentives</li> <li>Extension Service<br/>limited in technical<br/>capacity</li> <li>Imported equipment<br/>not of the best<br/>quality</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Limited<br/>knowledge and<br/>technical capacity<br/>among farmers</li> <li>Cannot afford<br/>installation cost</li> <li>Bad experience<br/>with mal-<br/>functioning<br/>system</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Farmer's<br/>income not<br/>sufficient and<br/>stable to make<br/>investment</li> <li>Training<br/>selective and<br/>does not reach<br/>most farmers</li> <li>Inadequate<br/>design and poor<br/>material</li> </ul>   |

 Table 18: Selected list of key barriers to the diffusion of improved drip irrigation

Figure 7 is a problem tree analysis for the limited use of improved drip/fertigation systems among small and medium-scale farmers in Belize. The main or focal problem is the limited use or non-use of drip irrigation and fertigation cultivation systems by small and medium size farmers. The over-arching "cause" is the *Limited knowledge and technical skills of drip irrigation/fertigation among small famers*. This stems from *Limited training for small farmers* and generally *Limited personnel and inadequate, specialized capacity in the farm extension services*. The analysis also outlines other related 'causes' as can be observed in the problem tree.



Figure 7: Problem tree for "not-widely use of drip irrigation/fertigation among small farmers."

The main, corresponding 'effects' threads through *Poor perception of drip irrigation / fertigation among small farmers; lower yields and limited income for individual farmers and communities; more forest needed to be cleared for rain-dependent agriculture; and more CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, lower yields/higher losses due to pest/diseases/extreme weather; and lower productivity; poor nutrition and increased health problems in farming/rural communities. Low productivity translates to lower income, reduced stimulation of the local economy and poorer farmers.* 

#### 2.3.2.1 Economic and financial barriers

Summary for Economic Evaluation of proposed drip irrigation systems

#### **Market Mapping**

A simplified market mapping (adapted from Nygaard and Hansen, 2015) for the transfer and diffusion of improved drip irrigation and fertigation systems is presented in Annex II E2.

#### Summary, barriers and gaps:

Reference the market mapping schematic for improved drip irrigation in Annex II.

- i. *Exporters/manufacturers of drip irrigation system & components/spares:* Procured from foreign manufacturers/outlets etc. by local importers & retailers of agro-technology equipment. Funds for procurement of irrigation equipment and components from importers/retailers will come from capital costs. Farmers may purchase from importers/retailers, or if they preferred, directly from the manufacturer/franchise.
- ii. *Import duties/taxes and subsidies:* Taxes may apply, but subsidies may be granted to importers which can be passed down to the farmers and institutions at the other end of the market chain.
- iii. *Importers and Retailers:* Equipment and spares for irrigation, fertigation, cover structures, nurseries, harvesting, cool storage facilities, solar-powered water pumps, and water tanks shall be imported from manufacturers or their outlets, and stocks will be made available for retailers and clients. Import taxes are mostly zero rated for irrigation and solar PV systems, but taxes may apply for certain components such as inverters, batteries, pvc pipes/fittings, and material to manufacture water tanks, etc.
- iv. Input and Service Providers: Inputs for crop protection, fertilizers, etc., and Service Providers for RE system installation (i.e. Solar PV, dryers, and cold storage facilities for grains) are available. The Research and Development Unit provides service and training for installing drip irrigation systems. Technology information and demonstration are made available to famers, but there is more to be done for expanded dissemination of relevant information and training of new technologies. Also, information and training in market principles and basic economics is limited, as is the need to utilize social media as a form for networking among producers, service providers/assemblers and importers. Another limitation or barrier is the limited level of education of many small and medium-scale farmers. Language barriers also exist in some instances.
- v. Enabling Business Environment: MOA and partners (CARDI, BELTRAIDE, IICA, DFC Agro-businesses, and others) are available to provide guidance and advise to farmers on issues related to affordable loans, other financing opportunities, market fluctuations and opportunities, and policy changes. The gap here seems to be limited networking among main actors. The leadership role here is the MOA, whose Extension Service and Policy Unit are closest to farmer's interests. The Extension Service plays a crucial role and must be empowered (through training, increased capacity and public relations guidance) to continue the good work of improving production and climate smart agriculture among the small and medium scale farmers. On their own, most small famers, and to a lesser extent, medium-scale farmers, do not have the capital to invest on a medium-size (5 10 acres)

irrigation system. Large farmers impact the environment to a greater extent, A gap exist here that requires the joint cooperation of key actors in the Sector to address with sustainable development programmes and outreach.

- vi. Policies and medium-term strategies must be updated and adopted to respond to the advances in technologies and changing market conditions, that if properly managed and use, can significantly improve yields of high quality, competitive products, with minimal impacts on the environment.
- vii. Training at specific links of the drip irrigation market change (e.g. Service Providers, MOA CRDU, Extension Service and at the Farm level) is paramount for successful operation. Farmer's outreach programme and MOA's Public Relations activities have room for improvement and expansion. Funds for capacity building and networking should be allocated from the operational budget.
- viii. Another gap identified is an Agriculture Testing/Certification Centre that can certify the quality of equipment, spares, inputs, seeds etc. The status of testing or certification is mainly for Phyto-sanitary, biosafety and risk analysis for import/export of organisms/products through BAHA, while the Pesticides Control Board is responsible for the safe use and control of pesticides.
  - ix. The economic and technical capacity of many small farmers to procure and operate an improved drip/fertigation irrigation system is generally limited. Medium-scale farmers would be the favoured target group in the market chain for this technology diffusion (L. Gladden, Chief, NCO, personal comm. Mar. 2018).
  - x. The Policy and Strategy for drainage and irrigation should be reviewed and implemented. The issue of integrated water resource management and irrigation becomes crucial, as the stress on this vital resource increases as a result of anthropogenic impacts in the watersheds, coupled with the increasing negative impacts of climate change on the rainfall regime. Spearheading this initiative should be the Water Management and Climate Change Unit of the Ministry of Agriculture.

#### Economic evaluation

a) Drip Irrigation Systems

Technology Application: Improved drip irrigation systems using rainwater harvesting and fertigation for crop nutrient requirement for five farmers groups plus a training centre at Central Farm

Table 19 and Figure 8 show a simplified investment cost estimate and the cash flow analysis for the proposed six improved, drip irrigation systems with fertigation. Feasibility of implementation of the proposed improved irrigation technology intervention was calculated on the basis of tomato cultivation.

| Capital Investment Cost | <ol> <li>Six only improved drip irrigativater abstraction facility to i         <ul> <li>US\$ 7,000.00 each</li> <li>Cost</li> <li>Six pumps @ US \$1,200.00</li> <li>Cost</li> <li>Six wells @ US \$7,000.00</li> <li>Cost</li> <li>Six 2,000 gallons Water Tankting @ US\$ 800.00 each</li> </ul> </li> </ol> | ution system with irrigation and<br>rrigate 6 acres:<br>US\$ 42,000.00<br>(3,000.00 solar)<br>US\$ 7,200.00 (18,000.00)<br>US\$ 42,000.00 |
|-------------------------|---|---|
|                         | Cost  | US\$ 4,800.00   |
|                         | 5) Training extension personne<br>@ US\$ 5,000.00   | l and four farmers groups   |
|                         | Cost  | US\$ 20,000.00  |
|                         | Total Cost  | US\$ 116,000.00 (126,800)   |
| Operating Cost          | Spares and maintenance per y  | year US\$ 15,000.00   |
|                         |   | 039 43,000.00   |

#### Table 19: Investment cost for six only improved drip irrigation systems



NPV: 213,300.00 US\$. IRR: 200.4%

(Source: Tobias, 2017)

Figure 8: Operating cash flow for proposed Drip Irrigation system

Implementation of an improved irrigation system is economically feasible as it increases the yields by approximately 40 percent. The commonly used water pumps fuelled with gasoline or diesel shall be exchanged with solar water pumps. The estimate is for six solar pumps for 6 units of 1 acre each.

Preliminary economic evaluation for the other prioritized technologies for the Agriculture sector are presented in Annex II of this Report.

The non-starter and crucial economic barriers prioritized during the stakeholder discussions were:

- Elevated initial cost to small farmers who would like to improve and expand their personal drip irrigation systems.
- Cost per unit of Drip/Sprinkler irrigation systems remains high.
- Cost of 'inputs' continue to rise. Middleman makes the profits, some small farmers barely break even, especially in the adverse economic climate.
- Credit and low-interest financing facilities not too attractive for small farmers.
- Maintenance cost could be beyond the means of many small operators.
- High import taxes and limited subsidies on spares and irrigation systems, including Solar PV components. (Not zero rated for importers).
- Elevated financial risks due to crop failure and other unforeseen events are high, in the absence of an establish and affordable insurance or risks transfer scheme. For example, an affordable portfolio for a 'multi-peril' crop insurance programme to cover the widest range of risks that could impact farmers and producers.

# 2.3.2.2 Non-financial barriers

Some key, non-financial barriers identified by stakeholders limiting increased used of improved drip irrigation and fertigation systems among farmers are:

- Farmers are still sceptical of their ability and resources to keep irrigation system functioning.
- Some farmers complain about the lack of effective support from local extension services.
- Farmers complain about 'too much politics' when dealing with Government Ministries.
- Extreme climatic events like floods and drought impacts becoming more frequent.
- General lack of knowledge on issues related to global warming, climate change and land degradation.
- Imported equipment not of the best quality.
- Unfavourable market status at harvest discourage farmers to invest.
- Constraints on drip irrigation market due to local economies-of-scale.

- Limited use of drip irrigation by farmers, particularly small-scale farmers.
- Technical capacity of Extension Service needs to be strengthened
- Land tenure issues.
- Rising fuel costs for operations and transportation cuts across all productive sectors and increases the unit cost of production.

#### **2.3.3 Identified measures**

Key measures or actions to address the main problem and related causes and effects highlighted in the 'Problem Tree' analysis earlier, are highlighted in the 'Solution or Objective Tree' depicted in Figure 9 below.



Figure 9: Objective tree for improved drip irrigation/fertigation use among small farmers

The measures, if implemented in a timely and cost-effective manner, should help realized the general objective: "Drip irrigation is widely used by small farmers".

The green, shaded boxes tracks one of several strategic pathways for solving the main problem '*Drip irrigation/fertigation not widely used by small farmers*'. This strategic pathway is further visualized in Table 20 below.

| Objective  | Measures   | Results   | Timeframe  |
|--|--|---|--|
| Drip irrigation<br>widely used by<br>small farmers | Enhance the knowledge &<br>technical skills of small<br>and medium-scale farmers<br>in drip irrigation &<br>fertigation technology,<br>through improved and<br>timely training and<br>demonstration<br>programme.  | <ul> <li>Positive attitude of drip<br/>irrigation among small<br/>farmers.</li> <li>Increased sales and use<br/>of irrigation technology</li> <li>Increased yields and<br/>income</li> <li>Improved livelihood<br/>and food security status</li> <li>Higher yields and more<br/>income</li> </ul>   | Short to medium<br>term. Main actors:<br>MOA CRDU,<br>CARDI, Extension<br>Service, etc. Funding<br>from capital cost.  |
|  | Conduct programme of<br>specialized training and<br>demonstrations to increase<br>efficiency of Farm<br>Extension Service<br>personnel. Training shall<br>be made available at the<br>local level and regional<br>institutions.  | <ul> <li>Efficient operation of<br/>irrigation systems</li> <li>Increased production &amp;<br/>yields</li> <li>Improved market<br/>opportunities and<br/>business environment</li> <li>Increased technical<br/>skills among farmers</li> <li>Professional service to<br/>producers and farmers</li> </ul>   | Medium term. Main<br>actors: CRDU and<br>experts in drip<br>irrigation/fertigation<br>technology and<br>agronomy. Funding<br>from capital and<br>operational costs<br>Medium term  |
|  | Increased lobby, where<br>necessary, for lower<br>importation duties, taxes,<br>subsidies for system<br>components.<br>Promote public awareness<br>and education on<br>technology and related<br>matters with programme<br>on the benefits of drip<br>irrigation, fertigation,<br>water & soil management,<br>water harvesting, among<br>farming communities and<br>other stakeholders | <ul> <li>Initial cost of Irrigation<br/>systems &amp; operations<br/>reduced</li> <li>Increased income for<br/>farmers which help<br/>stimulate local<br/>economy.</li> <li>Subsidies passed on to<br/>small and medium-<br/>size producers</li> <li>Availability of spares<br/>countrywide at<br/>reasonable cost for<br/>farmers &amp; others</li> <li>KAP of irrigation and<br/>climate smart</li> </ul> | Short to medium<br>term. Main actors:<br>policymakers in MOA,<br>NGOs, Farming<br>Cooperatives, other<br>partners in agriculture.<br>Medium to long term.<br>Main actors: MOA<br>CRDU, Extension<br>Service, Donor<br>agency (FAO,<br>others). Funding |

Table 20: Proposed strategic pathway for objective: 'Drip Irrigation widely used by small farmers'

|  | agriculture increased<br>among farmers<br>- Reduced M&O costs<br>- Less systems in<br>disrepair<br>- Positive Impact on<br>local economy  | likely from capital costs   |
|--|---|---|
| Identify and secure<br>affordable loans and<br>payment plans for farmers<br>through DFC/National<br>Bank, other Banks, Credit<br>Unions, special project<br>grants, project funds etc. | <ul> <li>Stemmed foreign<br/>exchange loss &amp; food<br/>insecurity</li> <li>Farmers encouraged to<br/>invest in irrigation and<br/>fertigation techniology<br/>in open filed and under<br/>PCSs.</li> <li>Improved pest<br/>management and yields</li> <li>Enhanced eco-<br/>agriculture practices</li> </ul> | Medium/long term.<br>Key actors: MOA<br>CRDU/Innovation<br>Centre, Partners.<br>Internal funds to<br>conduct research,<br>networking and<br>interviews. |

# 2.3.3.1 Economic and financial measures

The economic and financial measures identified include:

- Increase lobby (petitions, cabinet papers, advocacy actions, etc.) for lower importation duties and taxes for system components and other spares by key actors.
- Identify/develop lucrative markets for small producers. Cut out the middleman where necessary.
- Allocate adequate funds to strengthen the institutional and technical capacity of the Extension Services and R&D Unit to service the irrigation/fertigation systems for small and medium-scale farmers. Operations and Maintenance (O&M) costs could be beyond the means of many small operators
- Identify affordable guarantees and/or insurance for loans available in the short term; for the medium and long term, the establishment of a multi-peril crop insurance or risks transfer mechanism is proposed through financial establishments such as DFC, the National Bank, Credit Unions, etc.

## 2.3.3.2 Non-financial measures

The non-financial measures identified by stakeholders were:

- Institute training programme to enhance knowledge and technical skills of small and medium-scale farmers in installation and O&M of improve irrigation and fertigation systems.
- Promote public awareness and education programme on the benefits of drip irrigation among farming communities and other stakeholders.
- MOA R&D Innovation Centre spearheads advocacy drive to improve Agriculture Technology network among key actors and sectors such as: Agro Processing Sub-sector, BELTRAIDE, Credit Unions, the National Bank and other financial entities in the Private Sector, Mennonite community, Tourism sector, Commerce and Trade, including foreign manufacturers of agricultural equipment.

| Categories                   | Identified Barriers  | Measures to overcome  | Interv | ention | Funding      | Sources      |
|------------------------------|--|---|--------|--------|--------------|--------------|
|                              |  | barriers  |        |        |              |              |
|                              |  |   | Legal  | Other  | National     | External     |
|                              | <ul> <li>High initial<br/>investment of drip<br/>irrigation system</li> <li>Limitad subsidias</li> </ul>                                   | <ul> <li>Identify and secure<br/>affordable loans and<br/>payment plans for farmers<br/>through DFC/National Bank,<br/>other Banks, Credit Unions,<br/>special project grants, project<br/>funds etc.</li> </ul>                                    |        | V      | V            | V            |
| Economic<br>and<br>financial | <ul> <li>Control subsidies</li> <li>for technology</li> <li>components</li> <li>Cost of installation</li> <li>and operation may</li> </ul> | -Lobby for feduced import<br>tax duties on equipment and<br>irrigation system<br>components (Solar powered<br>pumps, solar panel<br>components, fertigation and<br>water harvesting equipment)<br>-Provide technology<br>companies & suppliers with | V      |        | V            |              |
|                              | be beyond the reach<br>of small operators  | concession to service<br>specific areas or groups of<br>clients at reduced service<br>costs (e.g. Public-private<br>partnership)  |        |        |              | $\checkmark$ |
| Market conditions            | <ul> <li>Gaps in<br/>technology value<br/>chain (supply and</li> </ul>   | - Set up local assembling<br>industry (small industry, job<br>creation initiative etc.)   |        |        | $\checkmark$ |              |

# Table 21: Summary of market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures for improved drip irrigation/fertigation system

|                       | demand)                    | - Establish demonstration  |              |              |              |              |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                       | -Market too small          | programme to help grow   |              |              |              |              |
|                       |                            | market for drip irrigation.  |              |              |              |              |
|                       | - Local hardware           | - Improve access to  |              |              |              |              |
|                       | stores often low in        | products and services  |              |              |              |              |
|                       | stocks of irrigation       | through subsidies that mat   |              |              |              |              |
|                       | spares &                   | be pass on to farmers.   |              | 2            | 2            | 2            |
|                       | components                 | Expand the market for new  |              | N            | N            | N            |
|                       |                            | technology and crop  |              |              |              |              |
|                       |                            | production in support of   |              |              |              |              |
|                       |                            | drip irrigation  |              |              |              |              |
|                       | - Incumbent                | - Implement policies &   |              |              |              |              |
|                       | monopoly in some           | regulations for favourable   |              |              |              |              |
|                       | areas; special             | market environmenr to help   |              |              |              |              |
|                       | interest groups; or        | level playing field  | ·            |              |              |              |
|                       | none use of drip           |  |              |              |              |              |
|                       | irrigation                 | <b>D</b> 1 1' '  |              |              |              |              |
|                       | - Inadequate policy        | - Recommend policy review  |              |              |              |              |
|                       | and regulatory             | and actions to improve   |              |              |              |              |
|                       | framework                  | enabling environment (e.g.   |              |              |              |              |
|                       |                            | seed policy, market  | $\checkmark$ |              |              |              |
|                       |                            | liberalisation, reduce   |              |              |              |              |
|                       |                            | protectionism and  |              |              |              |              |
| Legal and             |                            | monopoly of incumbent  |              |              |              |              |
| regulatory            | No office of               | Fetallish normation  |              |              |              |              |
|                       | - NO OTTICE OF             | - Establish regulatory   |              |              |              |              |
|                       | lesting and                | agency for standards,  |              |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
|                       | centification              | continuent seeds atc.)   |              |              |              |              |
|                       | - Import of cheaper        | - Strongthan regulatory  |              |              |              |              |
|                       | - Import of cheaper,       | framework (e.g.  | 2            |              | 2            |              |
|                       | aquipment/products         | implementation & penalty)  | N            |              | N            |              |
|                       | - Notworking               | - Enhance networking for   |              |              |              |              |
|                       | among                      | - Elinance networking for  |              |              |              |              |
|                       | among<br>professionals and | notato cultivation market  |              |              |              |              |
|                       | agencies weak and          | chain actors (e a  |              |              |              |              |
|                       | ineffective                | importers/retailors  |              |              |              |              |
|                       | menecuve                   | accemblers and clients)  |              |              |              |              |
| Network               |                            | - Strengthen research  |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |              |
| structures            |                            | development and  |              |              |              |              |
| buuuuus               |                            | demonstration of new   |              |              |              |              |
|                       |                            | technology (e.g. through   |              |              |              |              |
|                       |                            | CRDU MOA. Farmer's   |              |              |              |              |
|                       |                            | groups, CARDI, etc.)   |              |              |              |              |
|                       | – Farmers                  | – Strengthen Cooperative   | 1            |              | 1            |              |
|                       | cooperatives               | Department and form an   |              |              | $\checkmark$ |              |
| Network<br>structures | – Farmers                  | <ul> <li>Strengthen research,</li> <li>development and</li> <li>demonstration of new</li> <li>technology (e.g. through</li> <li>CRDU, MOA, Farmer's</li> <li>groups, CARDI, etc.)</li> <li>Strengthen Cooperative</li> <li>Department and form an</li> </ul> | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |

|        | generally work in    | national association of                    |              |              |              |
|--------|----------------------|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|        | insolation (crop     | farmer's cooperatives                      |              |              |              |
|        | specific)            |  |              |              |              |
|        | - Limited farmer-to- | - Increase local and regional              |              |              |              |
|        | farmer visits and    | farmer's networking. Use                   | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
|        | interactions         | ICT and social media.                      |              |              |              |
|        | - Limited awareness  | - Promote public awareness                 |              |              |              |
|        | and knowledge of     | and education on technology                |              |              |              |
|        | new technology       | and related matters with                   |              |              |              |
|        |                      | programme on the benefits of               |              |              |              |
|        |                      | drip irrigation, fertigation,              | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$ |
|        |                      | water & soil management,                   |              |              |              |
|        |                      | water harvesting, among                    |              |              |              |
|        |                      | farming communities and                    |              |              |              |
|        |                      | other stakeholders                         |              |              |              |
|        | -Low technical       | <ul> <li>Develop integrated and</li> </ul> |              |              |              |
|        | capacity             | on-going, specialized                      |              |              |              |
| Others |                      | training component in the                  |              |              |              |
|        |                      | technology diffusion                       |              |              |              |
|        |                      | programme using capital                    | ,            |              | ``           |
|        |                      | funds, targeting Extension                 |              |              |              |
|        |                      | Service and farmer's                       |              |              |              |
|        |                      | groups.                                    |              |              |              |
|        | – Farming            | <ul> <li>Through technology</li> </ul>     |              |              |              |
|        | communities and      | diffusion programme                        |              |              |              |
|        | farmers suspicious   | address social, cultural and               |              |              | 2            |
|        | and afraid of        | behavioural issues; improve                | v            |              | v            |
|        | change               | KAP* among users of new                    |              |              |              |
|        |                      | technologies                               |              |              |              |
|        | - Water scarcity     | - Develop and demonstrate                  |              |              |              |
|        |                      | guidelines on water                        | 2            | N            |              |
|        |                      | management and rainwater                   | v            | v            |              |
|        |                      | harvesting technologies                    |              |              |              |

A brief list of the outcomes of these measures are:

- Increased knowledge & technical skills of improved drip irrigation & fertigation technology among small farmers through technology diffusion programme.
- Highly trained cadre of Extension Service officers working with an adequate budget line.
- Improved synergies with other productive sectors such as Tourism sector, Commerce and Trade; Agro Processing Sub-sector, BELTRAIDE, Credit Unions, the National Bank and other financial entities in the Private Sector.

- Improve perception and knowledge of small and medium-size farmers on economic, environmental and social benefits that can be derived from improved drip irrigation / fertigation / water harvesting and renewable energy.
- Although most small and medium-scale farmers prefer traditional rainfed cultivation; their trust in the benefits of improved drip irrigation technology increases.
- Remove the politics/preference/favouritism in rendering aid/opportunities of farming groups, farming communities and individual farmers.
- Address issues related to land tenure and sustainable Land use and Land use change.
- Sustainable water use and water management amount stakeholders

# **2.4 Barrier analysis and possible enabling measures for crop covered structure cooling systems**

## 2.4.1 General description of crop covered structure cooling systems

A tropical greenhouse is not to provide a warm and humid environment for crop, but to create an ideal condition in which plants can be protected against heavy rainfalls, direct solar radiation, disease, insects and birds. High relative humidity and ambient temperature microclimate in a tropical greenhouse, create a complicated dynamic system that is strongly influenced by changes of external conditions, making it a challenging environmental control task (Shamshin & Wan Ismael, 2013). The central problem with tropical greenhouses or Protective Cropping or Covered Structures (PCSs) is the high, uncomfortable internal temperatures that develop during warm, sunny days, limiting the number of working hours inside these structures.

Protective Covered Structures were introduced in Belize under the 9<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund (EDF) financed Agriculture Enterprise Development project (AED), and was well received by vegetable farmers. Some structures have been properly managed and several farmers have experimented with lower cost design structures (Salazar, 2013; Frutos, 2014).

As indicated, one main purpose of Protective Covered Structure (PCS) is to create a controlled environment for optimum growing conditions compared to growing outside in a non-controlled environment (FAO, 2011). A farmer or grower has many options in the design of the greenhouse structure, and on how much control he/she may want or need for the crops that are being grown. Specifically, Protective Covered Structures (PCS) or Tropical Greenhouses contribute to increased productivity, improved produce quality, reduced cost of production, and reduce dependence on pesticides (Ramirez, 2010).

Protective Covered Structures in Belize are of four types, namely: Tropical Greenhouse, Bubble House, Bel Tunnel and Plastic Covered Structure (Ramirez, 2010; Reyes, 2010). Improved PCS designs and systems may incorporate the following cooling technologies:

- Natural Passive Ventilation (Air exchange) and shading systems;
- Mechanical Active Ventilation powered with a small diesel generator;
- Mechanical Active Ventilation powered with solar energy;
- Evaporative Cooling: i) Evaporative cooling fan-pads, and ii) High pressure fogging.
- Earth-to-air heat exchange system.

Natural Ventilation: Natural ventilation allows the greenhouse structure to ventilate and cool by natural air movement within and outside the structure. The objective of natural ventilation is to maintain the same temperature inside the greenhouse as it is outside the greenhouse. This can be hard to accomplish because of influences by the solar heat gain through the covering, the type of covering used on the structure and directional placement of the structure on the land in relation to the prevailing winds (Parsons, 2015; FAO, 2011). In greenhouses with natural ventilation, internal and external shade systems can control the heat generated by the solar gain. Shade systems also help control the intensity of the light in the greenhouse, however one disadvantage with shading is the reduction of photo synthetically active radiation (PAR) required by crops (Kumar, et al, 2009). Based on the design of the naturally ventilated greenhouse, one can expect to see temperature difference ranging from near ambient to 10 degrees or more. Kumar et al (2009) indicated that the volume/floor ratio of greenhouse should be large as possible if local wind speed is not too high to maintain favourable environment for crop growth, recommending that combined sidewall vent area should be equal to the combined ridge vent area, and each should be at least 15 - 20 % of the floor area of the greenhouse for tropical conditions.

### 2.4.1.1 Preliminary targets for technology transfer and diffusion

*Rehabilitation of Protective Covered Structure cooling systems:* The Government of Belize, through project funding, bought a total of 30 greenhouses at the rate of BZ\$ 30,000.00 back in 2010. Some of these greenhouses are still in use but the majority have fallen into disrepair and abandoned. Over the years the CRDU has also been refining the construction of Bel Tunnel cover structures, similar in design to the Tropical Greenhouse, but smaller in size. The technology transfer aims at installing improved cooling systems in at least eight (8) crop PCSs (tropical greenhouses) in operational use around the country, with the capacity to address the inefficient cooling systems for other crop cover structures as demands for this service increases. The beneficiaries will be both small and medium-scale farmers who routinely utilize crop cover structures.

Table 21 below is a summary of this technology transfer targets, including a simplified cost – benefit evaluation. See Table 7 and Annex II for review of targets and economic analysis for related technologies in the Agriculture sector.

| Sector: Technology  | Targets                | Too Ambitious    | Conservative              |
|---------------------|------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Agriculture         |                        |                  |                           |
| 5. Improved cooling | Refurbishing cooling   | Initial cost for | Yes.                      |
| system for Crop     | systems for at least 8 | cooling system   | Capital Costs: US\$       |
| cover structures    | crop cover structures. | components could | 109,500.00 for cooling    |
| (Tropical           | Intention is to        | be high for      | system refurbishment      |
| Greenhouses /Bel    | develop a business     | individual small | of (8) Tropical           |
| Houses)             | for rehabilitation of  | farmers.         | Greenhouses and Bell      |
|                     | existing cover         |                  | Tunnel Covered            |
|                     | structure cooling      |                  | structures.               |
|                     | system as demands      |                  | <b>Operational costs:</b> |
|                     | for installation       |                  | US\$ 28,000.00 for        |
|                     | increases and          |                  | three years (spares &     |
|                     | maintenance rises      |                  | maintenance).             |

# Table 22: Targets and possibility of attainment of technology transfer for improvedcooling systems for tropical greenhouses, Bubble Houses and/or BEL Houses

Spearheading this intervention is the Ministry of Agriculture's Crop Research and Development Unit (CRDU). The objective is to build technical capacity in the CRDU to initially improve the cooling system of the target eight (8) PCS, then provide similar installation and maintenance service to farmers and agro-industry enterprises, interested in upgrading their PCS cooling systems at an affordable cost.

# 2.4.2 Identification of barriers for protective covered structure cooling systems

The key barriers identified in random order by the Sector-based Technology Working Group (STWG) for upgrading the cooling systems of tropical greenhouses or PCS were:

- No specific budget and resources to rehabilitate PCS cooling systems.
- General lack of interest to invest in the refurbishment of cover structures.
- Limited knowledge and technical skills among user groups and farmers.
- Limited institutional capacity to address the problem with PCS cooling system.
- Initial cost for rehabilitation of PCS can be high for small and medium-scale farmers.
- Poorly designed tropical greenhouses.
- Very limited finance for replacement and maintenance.
- Inaccessibility to spares and material.

- Unfavourable market conditions at harvest discourages farmers to invest.
- Small market for cover structure technology because of limited use and supply.
- Lack of business strategy/plan for expansion of cover structure technology.
- Low-interest loans for purchasing new tropical greenhouses, or rehabilitating cooling system of incumbent PCS often not available for small producers.
- Local market for crop protective covered structure technology is small or non-existent.
- Water for drip irrigation system in PCS limited, especially during dry season.
- Energy to operate water pumps for irrigation water from rivers/streams, lagoons or wells, to an elevated tank not available at many locations.
- Farmers and operators complain about over-heated tropical greenhouses/PCSs
- High risk of losing investment during extreme weather events. PSCs that are not properly anchored are lost to high winds during passage of tropical cyclones or floods.
- Low prices for produce during harvest time little export market opportunities.
- Generally small economies of scale related to PCSs rehabilitation/construction.
- Vandalism and praedial larceny affects investment in PCS technology and another expensive agro-technology equipment.
- Rising cost of fuel for operational use and transportation.
- Cost of importing modern tropical greenhouses with modern technology cooling system is high, and out of reach for most small and medium-scale producers.

#### Selection and decomposition of critical barriers for diffusion of PCS cooling systems

The selection of killer (non-starter) and crucial barriers are summarised in Table 22, following an open selective process by members of the STWG using a Likert scale. Only barriers with score of 1 and 2 were considered for farther decomposition and evaluation as presented in Table 23.

| No. | Barriers             | Cr           | Criteria and Importance of Barriers for Technology 2 |           |           |                |      |
|-----|----------------------|--------------|--|-----------|-----------|----------------|------|
|     | Economic &           | 1. Critical  | 2.   | 3.        | 4.        | 5.             |      |
|     | Financial            | (killer,     | Crucial  | Important | Less      | Insignificant  | Rank |
|     |                      | non-starter) |  |           | important | (easy starter) |      |
| 1   | - High Initial costs | Х            |  |           |           |                | 1    |
|     | for rehabilitating   |              |  |           |           |                |      |
|     | PCS cooling          |              |  |           |           |                |      |
|     | systems (e.g. with   |              |  |           |           |                |      |
|     | solar powered fans)  |              |  |           |           |                |      |
| 2   | - Inaccessibility to |              | Х  |           |           |                | 2    |
|     | credits and limited  |              |  |           |           |                |      |
|     | low-interest         |              |  |           |           |                |      |
|     | financing, and non-  |              |  |           |           |                |      |
|     | favourable payment   |              |  |           |           |                |      |
|     | plans                |              |  |           |           |                |      |
| 3   | - High import taxes  |              | Х  |           |           |                | 2    |

#### Table 23: Criteria and Importance of Barriers for the diffusion of PCS cooling systems

|    | and limited           |   |   |   |   |       |
|----|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|-------|
|    | subsidies on          |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | components            |   |   |   |   |       |
| 4  | - Unpredictable       |   |   | х |   | 3     |
|    | market status at      |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | harvest time          |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | discourages farmers   |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | to invest             |   |   |   |   |       |
| 5  | - Rising cost of fuel |   |   | x |   | 3     |
| 5  | for operational use   |   |   | л |   | 5     |
|    |                       |   |   |   |   | 2     |
| 0  | - Lack of fisks       |   |   | X |   | 3     |
|    | transfer mechanism    |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | (e.g. multi-peril     |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | crop insurance,       |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | etc.)                 |   |   |   |   |       |
| 7  | - High cost of        |   |   |   | Х | 4     |
|    | importing and         |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | buying modern         |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | tropical green-       |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | houses with high-     |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | tech cooling          |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | systems               |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | - Lack of business    |   |   | Х |   | 3     |
|    | strategy to expand    |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | PCS technology        |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | locally               |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | - Finance/budget      | Х |   |   |   | 1     |
|    | line unavailable for  |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | effective O&M,        |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | including for PCS     |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | Non-financial         |   |   |   |   |       |
| 7  | - Farmers and         | x |   |   |   | 1     |
|    | operators             |   |   |   |   | -     |
|    | complain about        |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | over bested           |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | over-neated           |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | tropical green-       |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | houses/PCSs           |   |   |   |   |       |
| 8  | - General lack of     |   |   | Х |   | 1     |
|    | interest to invest    |   |   |   |   |       |
| 9  | - Limited subsidies   |   | Х |   |   | 2     |
|    | and incentives        |   |   |   |   | <br>  |
| 10 | - Generally small     | X |   |   |   | <br>1 |
|    | economies of scale    |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | related to PCSs       |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | and production for    |   |   |   |   |       |
|    | markets               |   |   |   |   |       |
| 11 | - Extension Service   |   | x |   |   | 2     |
|    |                       | 1 |   | 1 | 1 |       |

|    | limited in technical |   |   |  |   |
|----|----------------------|---|---|--|---|
|    | capacity             |   |   |  |   |
| 12 | - Limited technical  |   | Х |  | 3 |
|    | capacity among       |   |   |  |   |
|    | technicians & small  |   |   |  |   |
|    | farmers in effective |   |   |  |   |
|    | PCS cooling system   |   |   |  |   |
| 13 | - Rising fuel costs  | Х |   |  | 2 |
| 14 | - Limited            | Х |   |  | 2 |
|    | institutional        |   |   |  |   |
|    | capacity and         |   |   |  |   |
|    | market-driven        |   |   |  |   |
|    | opportunities to     |   |   |  |   |
|    | address dilemma      |   |   |  |   |
|    | of PCS cooling       |   |   |  |   |
|    | system               |   |   |  |   |
| 15 | - Small economies    |   | Х |  | 3 |
|    | of scale related to  |   |   |  |   |
|    | PCSs and             |   |   |  |   |
|    | production for       |   |   |  |   |
|    | market               |   |   |  |   |
| 16 | - Limited use of     | Х |   |  |   |
|    | PCS by small         |   |   |  |   |
|    | farmers              |   |   |  |   |

Selection of critical (killer or non-starter) barriers.

Table 24: Preliminary decomposition of killer or non-starter barriers to the diffusion ofPCS cooling system technology

| Category of             | 1. Critical (killer,   | 2. Crucial   | Elements of killer   | Dimension of   |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Barriers                | non-starter)   |  | or non-starters  | barrier elements   |
| Economic &<br>Financial | <ul> <li>Initial cost for<br/>rehabilitation of<br/>PCS can be high</li> <li>Very limited<br/>finance for<br/>replacement and<br/>general O&amp;M</li> <li>Inaccessibility to<br/>low-interest<br/>financing and<br/>suitable payment<br/>plans</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Inaccessibility to credits and limited low-interest financing facilities not too attractive for small farmers</li> <li>High import taxes and limited subsidies for components and spares</li> <li>Finance unavailable for effective O&amp;M, including for PCS</li> <li>Elevated financial risks due to crop failure</li> <li>Rising fuel prices</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>High interest rates</li> <li>High import duties<br/>on components</li> <li>Elevated cost of<br/>specialized<br/>services to<br/>rehabilitate and<br/>maintain PCS<br/>cooling systems</li> <li>Key components<br/>might not be in<br/>stock in country</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>12 – 15 % on certain components</li> <li>Service costs could be as high as 15 % of capital cost</li> <li>Interest rates could be 7 to 12 % per annum</li> </ul>   |
| Market<br>failures      | - Generally small<br>economies of<br>scale related to<br>PCSs  | - Limited<br>institutional<br>capacity and<br>market-driven<br>opportunities to<br>address dilemma of<br>PCS cooling system  | <ul> <li>Unstable and<br/>emerging market<br/>for PCS by<br/>majority of small<br/>farmers</li> <li>Incumbent and<br/>monopoly have<br/>greater slice of<br/>market</li> <li>Low demands</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Market policy and<br/>strategy not clear<br/>and focused</li> <li>Imports,<br/>contraband and<br/>monopoly skew<br/>market against<br/>local producers<br/>using PCS and<br/>irrigation</li> <li>Rainfed farming<br/>system<br/>(incumbent) still<br/>widely practiced</li> </ul> |
| Non-<br>financial       | <ul> <li>Farmers and<br/>operators<br/>complain about<br/>over-heated<br/>tropical green-<br/>houses/Protective<br/>Covered<br/>Structure</li> <li>Limited use of</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Limited subsidies<br/>and incentives</li> <li>Extension Service<br/>limited in technical<br/>capacity</li> <li>Imported<br/>equipment not of<br/>the best quality</li> <li>Limited use of PCS</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Limited<br/>knowledge and<br/>technical capacity<br/>among farmers to<br/>address dilemma</li> <li>Cannot afford re-<br/>designed cooling<br/>system costs</li> <li>Bad experience</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Farmer's income<br/>not sufficient and<br/>stable to make<br/>investment</li> <li>Training selective,<br/>and does not reach<br/>most farmers</li> <li>Inadequate design<br/>and poor material</li> </ul>   |

| PCS     | 's by medium   | by small farmers | with mal-          | - Technical         |
|---------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| and     | small farmers  |                  | functioning system | capacity in R&D     |
| - Exter | nsion Services |                  |                    | unit limited for    |
| limit   | ted in         |                  |                    | Task; may require   |
| tech    | nical capacity |                  |                    | specialized service |
|         |                |                  |                    | providers           |

Figure 10 is a Problem tree analysis use in conjunction with stakeholders input to study the focal problem posed by participants in the small group meetings. The focal problem that was identified was: "Over heated crop protective cover structures/greenhouses"



Figure 10: Problem tree for over-heated crop cover structure/tropical greenhouse

The main causes and effects related to this problem are highlighted in the analysis. Some of the main effects arising from the use of overheated tropical greenhouses in Belize are: Poor perception of the benefits of adequately ventilated crop cover structures among small farmers, traditional methods of cultivation still widespread, more forest is cut down to make way for rainfed agriculture, increasing overhead costs for refurbishment of some existing cover structures by some farmers and horticulturists, low yields due to pest and disease infestation, and reduced hours farmers can work under cover structures, low yields under heat-stressed environment, to name a few.

# 2.4.2.1 Economic and financial barriers

The economic barriers identified were:

- Initial high cost for refurbishment of cover structures.
- High cost to small famers for spares and maintenance.
- Small or limited inventory of spares by importers.
- High import duties and taxes on RE system components and spares (Solar PV);
- Financing for agriculture equipment and upgrades available (e.g. DFC, National Banks, Credit Unions, etc.); but interests on loans may not be at the reach of small farmers.

# 2.4.2.2 Non-financial barriers

The crucial non-financial barriers identified by the stakeholders were:

- Limited use of crop cover structures by small farmers in some districts.
- Limited institutional capacity and market-driven opportunities to address dilemma of PCS cooling system.
- Subsidies and incentives to invest on PCS not attractive.
- Extension Service have limited in technical capacity on improve PCS cooling system.
- Imported equipment not of the best quality.

Other non-financial barriers to consider are:

- Small farmers still mis-trust new technologies, especially those they cannot maintain.
- Limited or total lack of capacity to install and profitably operate a crop cover structure with adequate cooling system.
- Lack of adequate training and guidance to small farmers;
- Farmers may have one or two cover structures, but they cannot expand production with more cover structure because of limited resources and capacity.
- Cooling system technologies for cover structures are a bit complex and the local resources, knowledge and capacity to install the most efficient is unavailable because of the low in-country demands.

# **2.4.3 Identified measures**

The measures to overcome barriers and facilitate the smooth implementation of improved Protective Covered Structure cooling system technology, were identified using the Logical Problem Analysis (LPA) tool, namely an Objective tree. Stakeholders participation in this exercise was crucial, particularly the input of the Crop Research and Development Unit (CRDU) and personnel from CARDI.



Figure 11: Objective tree for the redesigned of cooler crop protective covered structure or tropical greenhouse

The general Objective proposed for the problem of "Over Heated Crop Cover/Tropical Greenhouses" was: "Cool Crop Covered Structure/Tropical Greenhouses". The green shaded boxes of 'measures' and 'results' is one of the proposed strategic pathways to help achieve this objective. Table 24 is a summary of the preliminary measures and results derived from the solution tree analysis. Other pathways from the Objective tree analysis can be traced or followed to help achieve the same general objective.

| Objective   | Measures   | Results  | Timeframe & Actors   |
|---|--|--|--|
| Cool crop cover<br>structures/tropical<br>greenhouses | Procure local or<br>external finance to<br>organise and run<br>training programme<br>for rehabilitation of<br>PCS cooling systems. | -Technical capacity<br>and skills of CRDU<br>technicians/officers<br>improved<br>-Farmers become more<br>interested to improved<br>cooling systems | Short to medium term.<br>Electrical engineers<br>will be contracted to<br>facilitate training and<br>demonstrations. |
|   | Procure finance (local<br>or external) for<br>refurbishment of PCS<br>cooling systems<br>powered with RE                           | -Most of the targeted<br>PCSs in good<br>operational conditions,<br>and conducive for<br>productive work   | Short to medium term.<br>R&D technicians<br>highly trained to<br>service PCS and install<br>new crop Protective      |

| Table 25: Proposed strategic pathway for objective, | 'Cool crop covered structure / |
|---|--------------------------------|
| tropical greenhouse'                                |                                |

|                         | - Controlled & cooler   | Covered Structures    |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
|                         | environment in cover    |                       |
|                         | structure/tropical      |                       |
|                         | greenhouse              |                       |
|                         | -Less heat stress for   | Short/Medium term     |
|                         | crops. Increase yields  |                       |
|                         | and stable or higher    |                       |
|                         | income                  |                       |
| CRDU redesigns PCS      | Farmers/operators can   | Medium/long term.     |
| for tropical conditions | work more hours in      | MOA CRDU              |
| using Renewable         | crop cover structures / |                       |
| Energy (solar PV) for   | Bel houses.             |                       |
| cooling systems         |                         |                       |
| Stakeholders lobby for  | Importers keep a        | Medium term.          |
| reduced import duties   | reliable                | Policymakers farmers  |
| & taxes for system      | inventory/stock of      | and partners          |
| components              | spares and components   | and partners          |
| components              | as market for Cover     |                       |
|                         | Structure grows         |                       |
|                         | Positive Impact on      | Medium term           |
|                         | local economy           |                       |
| Financial institutions  | Decreased overhead      | Medium/long term      |
| offer affordable        | costs for refurbishment | MOA Doliou Unit       |
|                         |                         | MOA Policy Unit,      |
| payment plans           |                         | Extension Service,    |
| (DEC / Cus dit Unions / |                         | farmers               |
| (DFC / Credit Unions /  |                         |                       |
| National Bank etc.).    |                         | <u>01</u>             |
| Finance is made         | Traditional methods of  | Short/medium term     |
| available at low        | planting smaller        |                       |
| interest rates, for     | acreage used less, and  |                       |
| initial cost, and for   | vermi-culture           |                       |
| operation and           | encouraged for organic  |                       |
| maintenance             | cultivation             |                       |
| Importers and           | Redesign enhances       | Short/medium term.    |
| Retailers keep          | cooler working          | Importers, retailers, |
| adequate stocks of      | conditions              | CRDU, partners        |
| spares and material for |                         |                       |
| PCSs                    |                         |                       |
|                         | Reduced losses due to   | Medium/long term      |
|                         | pest and diseases;      |                       |
|                         | enhances adaptation to  |                       |
|                         | Climate Change and      |                       |
|                         | food security           |                       |

# 2.4.3.1 Economic and financial measures

Some financial measures were:

- Facilitate reduced prices of equipment and spares for refurbishment;
- Request reduction on import duties and taxes for agriculture technology components (e.g. Cooling fans, humidifiers, Solar PV, other.);
- Facilitate accessibility to small interest loans by small farmers and affordable payment plans
- Provide market mechanism for small farmers to receive reasonable prices for farm produce
- Request increased budget for R&D& extension Services in Agriculture Sector.
- Identify niche markets for cover structure-cultivated, organically grown vegetables such as celery, sweet peppers, garlic, parsley, mushrooms, etc. (e.g. tourism sector).

## 2.4.3.2 Non-financial measures

Some of the non-financial measures identified included by stakeholders were:

- Institute a risk transfer scheme for small farmers (i.e. a special fund or multi-peril crop insurance scheme)
- Establish specialized training to enhance technical capacity and personnel at the CRDU.
- Training for small farmers conducted on a regular basis for the installation, maintenance, and agronomic operation of protective cover structures in all districts of Belize.
- Refurbishment and maintenance programmed by CRDU in coordination with farmers results in moderating temperature in Greenhouses/PCSs to near ambient temperature.
- Educate more small farmers on the economic, social and environmental benefits of cultivating under cool PCSs.
- Expand farmer's exchange programs in neighbouring countries that are profitably utilizing improved ventilated and cooler tropical greenhouse technology (e.g. Yucatan/Quintana Roo, Mexico, Guatemala and Honduras.).

Table 25 is a summary of barriers and corresponding measures to facilitate the diffusion of improved cooling systems for protective cover structures and PCS technology and use in general.

| Categories           | <b>Identified Barriers</b>   | Measures to overcome  | Intervention |              | Funding Sources |              |
|----------------------|--|---|--------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
|                      |  | barriers  |              |              |                 |              |
|                      |  |   | Legal        | Other        | National        | External     |
|                      | -High initial/capital investment   | - Expand access to finance  |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$    | $\checkmark$ |
| Economic             | <ul> <li>Limited subsidies<br/>and high import<br/>duties/taxes for<br/>technology</li> </ul>        | <ul> <li>Lobby for reduced import<br/>Tax on equipment and<br/>seeds</li> </ul>   | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$    |              |
| and<br>financial     | components<br>– High cost of<br>installation of<br>integrated cooling                                | - Provide technology<br>companies & suppliers<br>with concession to service   |              | ,            |                 |              |
|                      | systems for PCS  | specific areas or groups of<br>clients at reduced service<br>costs (Public-private<br>partnership)<br>– Conduct feasibility                   |              | N            |                 | N            |
|                      | <ul> <li>Gaps in technology<br/>value chain</li> </ul>   | study for setting-up local<br>assembling industry<br>– Expand access to<br>products and services<br>Grow the market for new                   |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$    |              |
| Market<br>conditions | <ul> <li>Local hardware<br/>stores often low in<br/>stocks of spares &amp;<br/>components</li> </ul> | technologies related to<br>PCS (solar water pumps,<br>water harvesting, drip<br>irrigation, inputs, etc.)                                     |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$    | $\checkmark$ |
|                      | <ul> <li>Unstable and small,<br/>monopoly, special<br/>interest groups<br/>control</li> </ul>        | <ul> <li>Implement policies &amp;<br/>regulations for favourable<br/>market climate</li> </ul>  | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$    |              |
|                      | <ul> <li>Inadequate policy<br/>and regulatory<br/>framework</li> </ul>                               | <ul> <li>Improve policy and<br/>enabling environment<br/>(e.g. seed policy, market<br/>liberalisation,<br/>protectionism, monopoly</li> </ul> | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$    |              |
| Legal and regulatory | - No office of testing   | of incumbent<br>technology)<br>– Establish regulatory   |              |              |                 |              |
|                      | and certification  | agency for standards,<br>testing and certification  |              |              | $\checkmark$    | $\checkmark$ |
|                      | - Import of cheaper,   | - Strengthen regulatory   | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$    |              |

# Table 26: Summary of barriers and corresponding measures for diffusion of PCSredesigned cooling system

|            | inferior-quality    | framework (e.g.                        |              |              |              |    |
|------------|---------------------|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|----|
|            | equipment/products  | implementation &                       |              |              |              |    |
|            |                     | penalty)                               |              |              |              |    |
|            | - Networking among  | - Enhance networking for               |              |              |              |    |
|            | professionals and   | PCS technology/                        |              |              |              |    |
|            | agencies weak and   | improved drip irrigation               |              |              |              |    |
|            | ineffective         | - Strengthen research,                 |              |              |              |    |
|            |                     | development and                        |              | N            | N            | N  |
|            |                     | demonstration for                      |              |              |              |    |
|            |                     | improved PCS                           |              |              |              |    |
| Network    |                     | technology                             |              |              |              |    |
| structures | – Farmers           | - Strengthen Cooperative               |              |              |              |    |
|            | cooperatives        | Dep. and association of                |              |              |              |    |
|            | generally work in   | farmer's cooperatives.                 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |    |
|            | insolation (crop    | Use modern ICT for                     |              |              |              |    |
|            | specific)           | networking                             |              |              |              |    |
|            |                     | - Increase local and                   |              |              |              |    |
|            | - Limited farmer to | regional farmer's                      |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |    |
|            | farmer visits       | networking                             |              |              |              |    |
|            | - Limited awareness | – Establish management                 |              |              |              |    |
|            | and knowledge of    | programme and                          |              |              |              |    |
|            | new technology      | education/awareness                    |              |              |              |    |
|            |                     | campaign among key                     |              | ,            |              | `` |
|            |                     | stakeholders for new                   |              |              |              |    |
|            |                     | technology                             |              |              |              |    |
|            | - Low technical     | – Establish training                   |              |              |              |    |
| Others     | capacity            | component in                           |              |              |              |    |
| outers     |                     | technology diffusion                   |              | ·            |              | ,  |
|            |                     | programme                              |              |              |              |    |
|            | – Farming           | <ul> <li>Through technology</li> </ul> |              |              |              |    |
|            | communities and     | diffusion programme                    |              |              |              |    |
|            | farmers suspicious  | address social, cultural               |              |              |              |    |
|            | and afraid of       | and behavioural issues;                |              |              |              | ,  |
|            | change              | improve KAP* among                     |              |              |              |    |
|            |                     | users                                  |              |              |              |    |

# 2.5 Barrier analysis and possible enabling measures for in-country Irish potato clean-stock production unit to produce quality seed-tuber planting material varieties.

An initiative is underway to develop a business plan for the University of Belize (UB) Plant Micro-propagation laboratory at the Central Farm campus. Seed (germ plasm) of new varieties of white, Irish potato good for making chips and resilient to warmer temperatures and drought could be a crop for the prioritized "Crop Diversification and New Variety". The UB Plant Propagation Laboratory could serve as the institution to test, validate, and reproduce seedlings for experimental plots. Through the MOA, these will be disseminated to farmers.

## 2.5.1 General description of in-country Irish potato clean-stock production unit

Since potato was first planted in Belize it has been observed that after one season in the field the crop becomes infected with insect-transmitted viruses. As a result, tubers collected from one season become diseased and cannot be used as seed-tubers for planting the following season. To address this issue, fresh, quality potato seed tubers are imported from the United States into Belize each year. Unfortunately, these varieties have been developed for the temperate climates of northern latitudes.

With global warming on the horizon, unless more suitable varieties are made available to farmers, it may become impossible to produce potatoes in Belize. If this were allowed to occur, the country's food security could be jeopardized. Officials in Belize have not, so far, investigated alternative potato varieties, but the urgency to do so increases with the advancing threat of climate change.

The problem can be addressed by introducing technology for an in-country potato seed-tuber production system. The system will ensure quality, disease-free and diversified potato varieties that have been trailed locally and demonstrated for high productivity under Belize's tropical conditions and made available to farmers.

Additionally, this technology will permit an increase in national potato production by expanding potato farming in current producing communities to months when production has not previously been possible, and by expanding potato farming into other communities which are too warm for potato farming using the varieties currently available. This will not only reduce the need to import potatoes to supply the national consumer markets, but it will also save on foreign exchange by eliminating the annual requirement to import expensive, foreign sourced seed-tubers. An improved and expanded potato production system resilient to warmer climatic conditions would enhance national food security and bring economic benefits for many farming communities in Belize.

#### Medium-term Strategic Action Plan for Horticulture (Potato) Cultivation, MOA

#### **Program:** Horticulture

This strategic plan is derived from the workplans submitted by the different units of the Horticulture Section.

**Objective:** To increase production, productivity and competitiveness of horticulture crops in a sustainable manner through the promotion of climate smart agriculture.

**Timeframe**: 2017 - 2020

| Target    | Objective   | Components  | Deliverables   | Location | Lead       | Partner   |
|-----------|---|---|--|----------|------------|---|
| Commodity |   | (how? Strategy)   | 2017 - 2018  |          | Person     |   |
| Potato    | To extend<br>the locally<br>produced<br>supply of<br>potatoes<br>from 2 to<br>4 months. | <ol> <li>Conduct<br/>preliminary<br/>varietal trials to<br/>determine<br/>extension of<br/>planting season.</li> <li>Reduce post-<br/>harvest losses</li> <li>Increase<br/>storability</li> <li>Manage pest<br/>and diseases in a<br/>sustainable<br/>manner.</li> <li>Promote the<br/>production of<br/>potatoes that meet<br/>consumer<br/>preferences and<br/>national standards.</li> </ol> | <ol> <li>Best varieties<br/>for storage<br/>identified.</li> <li>Farmer training<br/>guide for post-<br/>harvest and<br/>storage of<br/>potatoes.</li> <li>Report on<br/>varietal<br/>performance<br/>during off-season<br/>planting.</li> <li>Report on<br/>varietal<br/>performance<br/>under storage<br/>conditions</li> <li>X trainings of<br/>producers in the<br/>national standards<br/>of potatoes.</li> </ol> | Cayo     | C.<br>Teck | DAC<br>Cayo,<br>BAHA.<br>PCB,<br>CARDI<br>Farmer<br>Group |

Table 27: Short term strategy for expanding Potato cultivation

(Source: Strategic Action Plan 2017 - 2020, Ministry of Agriculture, July 2017)

Process: There will be a need for an Expert (Consultant) for two weeks – prior to the project implementation — to develop a full project document for the establishment of a potato seed-tuber production unit/system in Belize, and for the introduction and trials of potato varieties suitable for the market and growing conditions in country.

Figure 12 shows a flow diagram of the steps to the produce certified tuber-seed for quality potato harvest. Field trials for micro propagated seedling and dissemination of certified potato seeds will proceed as follow:

- 1) Initial field trial evaluation of (10) certified varieties by Ministry of Agriculture Research and Development Unit and selected farming groups. This will run for two years.
- 2) Concurrently, work will begin, using selected varieties, to develop and establish the certified tuber seed production system.
- 3) In the third year, the best performing varieties from the field trials will be introduced into the in-country, seed certification system for later distribution to farmers.



#### Figure 12: Process for the production of certified tuber-seed for quality potato harvest

#### International Potato Centre

The International Potato Centre (CIP) is a non-profit international agricultural research-fordevelopment organization with a focus on potato, sweet potato, and Andean roots and tuber crops. CIP's vision is "roots and tubers improving the lives of the poor". Its mission is to contribute towards food security and improved well-being in the developing world through research and partnerships guided by science, state-of-the-art technology, and training. The headquarters of CIP is in Lima, Peru, with branches in over 30 locations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. CIP is a member of the Consultative Group of International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), consisting of 15 research centres mostly in the developing world, and supported by more than 50 major public and private donors.

# **2.5.2 Identification of barriers for in-country Irish potato clean and certified seedtuber production**

A list of the general barriers identified by stakeholders to ease the transfer of 'in-country Irish Potato clean stock production' were:

- Legislative framework/strategic plan does not effectively address the potential of potato cultivation for the country.
- Very narrow or limited policy for improving the potato varieties cultivated in Belize.
- High cost to farmers to purchase the annual imported Red la Roche Irish potato variety seeds.
- Potato cultivated in only selected locations by few farmers during cool transition period (i.e. December February).
- High initial cost for small farmers to cultivate potato.
- Training and capacity-building for small farmers is limited.

- Limited institutional capacity (i.e. Extension Service inadequately manned and financed.
- Low priority given to potato cultivation.
- Institutional capacity at the UB Plant Propagation Laboratory to micro-propagate climate resilient Irish potato breeder seedlings limited.
- An effective business plan to expand the Plant Micro-Propagation Laboratory does not exist.
- Seedings of cool season Irish Potato varieties imported annually by private interest to make a profit.
- Moderate to high interest rates to make a loan to establish a potato crop for a season.
- Lack of loan guarantee for small producers.
- High risk to crop failure due to extreme conditions at the end of the hurricane season and unusually warm cool seasons.
- In-country Research and Development in potato variety trials/cultivation very limited or none-existent due to adequate funding and market demand for climate resilient, micro-propagated seed-tubers.
- The perception that is cheaper to import potato. This stifles agriculture production and only selected importers benefits.
- Inability of farmers to produce for the market at a profitable rate due to instability of local market for potato, and non-international market opportunities.
- High Initial costs for refurbishing Micro-propagation laboratory for production of certified potato seed-tubers.
- Incumbent monopoly, and resistant by 'interest parties' for an alternative option to access certified Irish potato seed-tubers planting material.

#### Selection and decomposition of critical barriers for diffusion of improved drip irrigation

| No. | Barriers                 | Cı            | Criteria and Importance of Barriers for Technology 2 |           |           |                |      |
|-----|--------------------------|---------------|--|-----------|-----------|----------------|------|
|     | Economic &               | 1. Critical   | 2.   | 3.        | 4.        | 5.             |      |
|     | Financial                | (killer, non- | Crucial  | Important | Less      | Insignificant  | Rank |
|     |                          | starter)      |  |           | important | (easy starter) |      |
| 1   | - High Initial costs for | Х             |  |           |           |                | 1    |
|     | refurbishing Micro-      |               |  |           |           |                |      |
|     | propagation              |               |  |           |           |                |      |
|     | laboratory for           |               |  |           |           |                |      |
|     | production of            |               |  |           |           |                |      |
|     | certified potato seed-   |               |  |           |           |                |      |
|     | tubers                   |               |  |           |           |                |      |
| 2   | - Access to limited      |               | Х  |           |           |                | 1    |
|     | low-interest financing   |               |  |           |           |                |      |
|     | limited                  |               |  |           |           |                |      |

# Table 28: Criteria and Importance of Barriers for improved drip irrigation and fertigation

| 3  | - High import taxes      |   | Х |   |   | 2 |
|----|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
|    | and limited subsidies    |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4  | - Unfavourable market    | Х |   |   |   | 3 |
|    | status at harvest        |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | discourage farmers to    |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | invest                   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5  | - Elevated financial     |   | Х |   |   | 2 |
|    | risks due to crop        |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | failure                  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 6  | - Lack of risks transfer |   |   | Х |   | 3 |
|    | mechanism                |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | - Foreign exchange       |   |   |   | Х | 4 |
|    | and corresponding        |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | banking                  |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | Non-financial            |   |   |   |   | 2 |
| /  | - Frustrating land       |   |   | Х |   | 3 |
| 0  | Limited use of drip      |   |   |   |   | 1 |
| 0  | - Limited use of drip    | Х |   |   |   | 1 |
| 0  | Limited subsidios        |   | v |   |   | 2 |
| 9  | - Lillinea subsidies     |   | Х |   |   | 2 |
| 10 | Constraints on drin      |   | v |   |   | 2 |
| 10 | - Constraints on unp     |   | А |   |   | 2 |
|    | to local economies of    |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | scale                    |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | searc.                   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 11 | - Extension Service      |   | X |   |   | 2 |
|    | limited in technical     |   |   |   |   | _ |
|    | capacity                 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 12 | - Limited technical      |   |   | X |   | 3 |
|    | capacity among small     |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | farmers                  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 13 | - Rising fuel costs      |   | Х |   |   | 2 |
| 14 | - Rising costs of        |   |   | Х |   | 3 |
|    | transportation           |   |   |   |   |   |
| 15 | - Incumbent              |   | Х |   |   | 2 |
|    | monopoly, and            |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | resistant by             |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | 'interest parties'       |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | for an alternative       |   |   |   |   |   |
|    |                          |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | to access certified      |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | Irish potato seed-       |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | tubers planting          |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | material                 |   |   |   |   |   |

 Table 29: Selection of killer or non-starter barriers to the diffusion of micro-propagation of climate resilient Potato certified seed-tubers

| Category of             | 1. Critical (killer,   | 3. Crucial   | Elements of killer   | Dimension of  |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Barriers                | non-starter)   |  | or non-starters  | barrier elements  |
|                         |  |  |  |   |
| Economic &<br>Financial | - High Initial costs<br>for irrigation<br>systems                                | <ul> <li>Credits and limited<br/>low-interest financing<br/>facilities not too<br/>attractive for small<br/>farmers</li> <li>High import taxes and<br/>limited subsidies for<br/>irrigation<br/>components/spares</li> <li>Elevated financial<br/>risks due to crop<br/>failure</li> <li>Rising fuel prices</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>High interest rates</li> <li>High import<br/>duties of<br/>components</li> <li>Elevated cost of<br/>specialized<br/>services</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>12 – 15 % on certain components</li> <li>Service cost could be as high as 15 % of capital cost</li> <li>Interest rebates could be 6 to 12 % per annum</li> </ul>   |
| Manlast                 | I.I., f 11   | Constraints on drin  | Unotoble membres   | Monket realizer   |
| Market<br>failures      | - Unfavourable<br>market status at<br>harvest<br>discourage<br>farmers to invest | - Constraints on drip<br>irrigation market due<br>to local economies of<br>scale.  | <ul> <li>Unstable markets</li> <li>Incumbent and<br/>monopoly have<br/>greater slice of<br/>market</li> <li>Supply greater<br/>than demands</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Market policy<br/>and strategy not<br/>clear ad focus</li> <li>Middleman<br/>strongly influence<br/>prices, returns for<br/>producers often<br/>not equitable</li> <li>Imports,<br/>contraband and<br/>monopoly skew<br/>market against<br/>local producers</li> </ul> |
|                         |  |  |  |   |
| Non-<br>financial       | - Limited use of<br>drip irrigation by<br>farmers                                | <ul> <li>Limited subsidies and<br/>incentives</li> <li>Extension Service<br/>limited in technical<br/>capacity</li> <li>Imported equipment<br/>not of the best quality</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Limited<br/>knowledge and<br/>technical capacity<br/>among farmers</li> <li>Cannot afford<br/>installation cost</li> <li>Bad experience<br/>with mal-<br/>functioning system</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Farmer's income<br/>not sufficient and<br/>stable to make<br/>investment</li> <li>Training<br/>selective and<br/>does not reach<br/>most farmers</li> <li>Inadequate<br/>design and poor<br/>material</li> </ul>   |

Figure 13 shows a Problem tree analysis conducted with some key stakeholders to identify the main causes and effects to the focal problem: "Irish Potato imported seeds are cool season varieties only and not climate resilient".

Some of the main causes and effects contributing to this dilemma are outlined in the Problem tree and were derived from the general list of current barriers listed by the stakeholders.

Some of the glaring effects of this problem include

- 1) Potato cultivation in Belize confined only to the cool season and in few localities.
- 2) Only few farmers benefit from this potential industry.
- 3) Limited capacity and opportunities of other farmers interested in potato cultivation.
- 4) When local production is consumed, Government imports potato. Only the selected few importers benefits.
- 5) Cash crop diversification limited. Economic opportunities frequently missed!
- 6) Very limited storage facility, hence farmers must sell at lower prices after harvest.
- 7) Middleman set prices, income for growers low, and indirectly impacts community.
- 8) The *status quo* persists: crop vulnerable to climate change; adding to elevated risk to food security;
- 9) Lower income opportunities for farmers
- 10) UB Plant Micro-Propagation Laboratory under utilized.
- 11) Elevated risks arising due to crop failure may result in loss of assists and investment.
- 12) Policy short-sighted with respect to the potential of expanding in potato cultivation.



Figure 13 : Problem Tree for imported none-climate resilient potato seeds

## 2.5.2.1 Economic and financial barriers

#### Market Mapping for transfer and diffusion of clean, certified seed tuber Potato varieties

#### Summary, barriers and gaps

Reference Market mapping schematic for micro-propagation of clean, climate resilient, certified Irish potato seed-tubers in Annex II H2.

- i. *Source Basic Seeds (Clean parent material):* Procured from potato breeding centres in the United States and/or the International Potato Centre in Peru (CIP). Private sector importers, GOB through MOA/UB, CARDI, others.
- ii. *Import duties/taxes and subsidies:* Taxes may apply, but subsidies may be granted to importers which can be passed down to the farmers at the other end of the market chain.
- iii. UB micro-propagation laboratory: Equipment and material will have to be procured in the capital cost for up-grading laboratory facilities, and fund must be available for first 2.5 years of operation and maintenance. Funds for expert consultant for developing production strategic workplan and guidelines for micro-propagation of 'Source Basic Seeds'' to certified potato seed tubers for farmers, must be part of the capital costs. Training of micro-propagation laboratory technicians and field workers, and farmer's outreach programme and technology awareness/education campaign, should be funded from capital cost.
- iv. *Importers and Retailers:* Equipment and spares for irrigation, fertigation, cover structures, nursery, and water pumping/harvesting and storage, shall be imported, and

stocks available. Import taxes are mostly zero rated for irrigation and solar PV systems, but taxes are applied for certain components such as inverters, batteries, and miscellaneous spares.

- v. *Input and Service Providers:* Generally available. Gaps exist in provision of information on technology and the changing market, and also networking among producers and service providers and importers.
- vi. *Enabling Business Environment:* MOA and partners (CARDI, BELTRAIDE, IICA, DFC and others) are available to provide guidance and advise to farmers on issues related to affordable loans, other finance opportunities, the market, and policy changes. The gap here seems to be limited networking among main actors, the leadership role here is the MOA, whose extension service and policy office is closest to farmers. The Extension Service plays a crucial role and must be empowered (through training, increased capacity and public relations) to continue the good work of improving production among the small and medium scale farmers.

The micro-propagation of climate resilient, Source Basic Seeds of Irish Potato is envisioned to become sustainable and profitable in the medium term as potato production increases, and market opportunities are secured.

The key economic and financial barriers short-listed by the stakeholders were:

- High initial cost for small farmers to cultivate potato.
- Moderate to high interest rates to make a loan to establish a potato crop for a season.
- High cost to farmers to purchase the annual imported Red la Roche Irish potato variety seeds
- In-country Research and Development in potato variety trials/cultivation very limited or none-existent due to adequate funding or a recurrent budget.
- Lost of investment due to elevated risks related to crop failure.
- In In-country Research and Development in potato variety trials/cultivation very limited or none-existent due to adequate funding or a recurrent budget.
- Inability of farmers to market produce at a profitable rate due to instability of local market or non-international market opportunities.

# 2.5.2.2 Non-financial barriers

Some of the most critical non-financial barriers included:

- Legislative framework/strategic plan does not effectively address the potential of potato cultivation.
- Very narrow or limited policy for improving the potato varieties cultivated in Belize.
- Potato cultivated in only selected locations by few farmers during cool transition period (i.e. December February).
- Training and capacity for small farmers limited.
- Limited institutional capacity (i.e. Extension Service inadequately manned and financed.
- Low priority given to potato cultivation.
- Institutional capacity at the UB Plant Propagation Laboratory to micro-propagate climate resilient Irish potato breeder seedlings limited.
- Farmers afraid to diversify to non-traditional crops.
- High risk to crop failure due to extreme conditions.
- Institutional capacity in the MOA/private sector very limited to take advantage of the economic opportunities that a vibrant potato industry could offer.

# Summary of key barriers for micro-propagation and successful diffusion of clean, certified Irish Potato seed-tubers

Clean, certified Irish potato seed-tubers replicated locally through micro-propagation of imported climate resilient, 'source basic seed' would probably be twice the cost of a unit of incumbent seeds, but GOB subsidy would make it affordable for farmers. Certified seeds-tubers will be climate resilient and tested to be more adaptable to warmer and drier conditions and yields per acre or hectare can be higher with the appropriate input. Initial cost for drip irrigation (if used) is not included, but the benefits to potato growers would be profitable in the short and medium term. If storage is available, farmers will very likely be able to fetch higher prices per unit weight of their potato as market demands increase.

The killer barriers for this technology transfer is the capital costs and time constraints for upgrading the UB Micro-Propagation Laboratory facilities and building necessary technical capacity. Also, another barrier is the need to accelerate the actual micro-propagation of imported 'Source Basic Seeds (i.e. clean parent material) to micro-tuberization stage, reproduction of mini-tubers in screen houses (protective covered structures), and then mini-tuber germination to produce certified seed-tubers for farmers. However, the propagation of new batches of clean, planting material will be staggered and ongoing, once the process commences; so, there will always be mini-tubers in storage and at the stage of germination, to produce additional quantities of certified seed-tubers for growers. Trials on different varieties of Irish potato could be encourage at random, specifically for varieties that meet certain market demand, both locally and regionally, and in this way, Belize may be able to develop a profitable, potato production industry.

#### 2.5.3 Identified measures

The 'measures' and 'results' to achieve the proposed Objective: "Climate resilient varieties of Potato seed micro-propagated in country", were analysed in the Objective tree depicted in Figure 14 and presented in a matrix in Table 9. The green-shaded boxes in the Objective tree provide one option for a strategic pathway to effectively realize the general Objective stated.

The measures and results in Table 9 are not necessarily in an order of importance but can later be arrange in perspective in a formal strategic plan. However, first and foremost would be policy framework: "A policy and strategic plan to effectively address the reality of potato cultivation", followed by addressing the "institutional and technical capacity" to implement actions to expand potato cultivation in Belize. Next would come the "Political will and budget allocation for programs in climate resilient Irish Potato cultivation". Local funds and Donor Agencies resources will have to be procured to successfully impellent the programme of actions. Beneficiaries will include: existing and new potato-growing farmers, MOA, consumers, University of Belize Faculty of Agriculture, Partners in R&D in Agriculture, and other stakeholders.



Figure 14: Objective Tree for in-country micro-propagated climate resilient potato seeds

## Table 30: Proposed strategic pathway for objective, 'Climate resilient varieties of Irish Potato seed micro-propagated in country'

| Objective           | Measures   | Results                                     | Timeframe           |
|---------------------|--|---|---------------------|
| Climata resilient   | Adequate institutional<br>and technical capacity | Climate resilient Irish<br>potato varieties | Medium to long term |
| variation of Irish  | 1 5  | planted in most                             |                     |
| Detector and a mism |  | localities                                  |                     |
| Potato seeas micro- |  |   |                     |
| propagated in       | Reasonable number of                             | -Increased knowledge                        | Short/medium term   |
| country             | specialized                                      | of the benefits of                          |                     |
|                     | experts/trained                                  | climate resilient potato                    |                     |
|                     | personnel in Extension                           | varieties;                                  |                     |
|                     | Service  | -More farmers                               |                     |
|                     |  | cultivate potato;                           |                     |
|                     |  | -equitable income                           |                     |
|                     |  | opportunities for more                      |                     |
|                     |  | farming communities.                        |                     |
|                     | High recruitment /                               | Adequate delivery of                        | Short/Medium term   |
|                     | mobility in Agriculture                          | Extension Service to                        |                     |
|                     | Sector & agro-industry                           | farmers.                                    |                     |
|                     | Policies & strategic                             | Market demands                              | Medium/long term    |
|                     | plan of action effective                         | satisfied; increased                        |                     |
|                     | to address reality                               | agro-processing and                         |                     |
|                     |  | raduced value industries,                   |                     |
|                     |  | notato                                      |                     |
|                     | Political will and                               | -farmers have                               | Medium term         |
|                     | budget allocation for                            | resources for                               |                     |
|                     | programs in climate                              | curing/storage                              |                     |
|                     | resilient Irish Potato                           | -Increased income for                       |                     |
|                     | cultivation                                      | farmers; stimulates                         |                     |
|                     |  | local economy                               |                     |
|                     | Low importation                                  | Micro propagation                           | Medium term         |
|                     | duties and taxes for                             | Laboratory facilities                       |                     |
|                     | Breeder seed material                            | expanded. Specialized                       |                     |
|                     | benefiting                                       | training; increased                         |                     |
|                     | importers/seed                                   | R&D programme                               |                     |
|                     | propagation laboratory                           |   |                     |
|                     | Micro-propagated                                 | Higher yields; fair                         | Medium/long term    |
|                     | seeds cheaper &                                  | control prices and                          |                     |
|                     | climate resilient                                | reduced food                                |                     |
|                     |  | insecurity arising from                     |                     |
|                     |  | extreme weather                             |                     |

| Funds available for<br>more farmers to<br>acquire certified seeds<br>(sources:<br>DEC/Banks/Credit | Stemmed foreign<br>exchange of dollars &<br>reduce food insecurity | Medium/long term |
|--|--|------------------|
| DFC/Banks/Credit   |  |                  |
| Unions)  |  |                  |

2.5.3.1 Economic and financial measures

The short list of economic measures includes:

- Procure funds for pilot project to conduct a feasibility study/guidelines and procedures to conduct successful climate resilient potato seed micro propagation and protected cover nurseries for certified seedling trials
- Develop and marketing strategy for sale of in country, micro-propagated Irish potato 'certified' seeds.
- Funds available in the form of soft loans for more farmers to acquire certified seeds and expand potato cultivation (e.g. from DFC/The National Bank/Credit Unions etc.).
- Low importation duties and taxes for Breeder seed material benefiting importers/seed propagation laboratory
- Government facilitate market opportunities for potato producers, including "value added";
- Increased job opportunities that stimulate local economy.

## 2.5.3.2 Non-financial measures

Critical none-financial measures identified were:

- Cool and warm season, climate resilient potato varieties available;
- Micro-propagated seeds cheaper and climate resilient;
- A more trained and energized Extension Service providing technical advice to potato growers in Belize;
- Benefits of 'added value' encourages more farmers to purchase and cultivate micropropagated, climate resilient varieties
- Potato crop treatment and cool storage facilities increased at key locations.

| Categories                   | Identified Barriers   | Measures to overcome   | Intervention |              | Funding Source |              |
|------------------------------|---|--|--------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
|                              |   | ourrens  | Legal        | Other        | National       | External     |
|                              | -High initial investment  | - Expand access to finance   | U            | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$   | $\checkmark$ |
|                              | <ul> <li>Limited subsidies<br/>for technology<br/>components</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Lobby for reduced import</li> <li>Tax on equipment and</li> <li>seeds</li> </ul>  |              |              |                |              |
| Economic<br>and<br>financial | <ul> <li>High cost of installation</li> </ul>                           | <ul> <li>Provide technology</li> <li>companies &amp; suppliers</li> </ul>  |              |              |                |              |
|                              |   | with concession to service<br>specific areas or groups of<br>clients at reduced service<br>costs (Public-private<br>partnership) |              | V            |                | $\checkmark$ |
|                              | - Gaps in technology value chain  | - Set up local assembling<br>industry  |              |              | $\checkmark$   |              |
|                              | – Local hardware  | - Improve access to  |              |              |                |              |
| Market conditions            | stores often low in stocks of spares &                                  | products and services.<br>Grow the market for new  |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$   | $\checkmark$ |
|                              | – Unstable,<br>monopoly, special<br>interest groups                     | <ul> <li>Implement policies &amp;<br/>regulations for favourable<br/>market climate</li> </ul>                                   | $\checkmark$ |              |                |              |
|                              | - Inadequate policy<br>and regulatory                                   | - Improve policy and<br>enabling environment   |              |              |                |              |
|                              | framework   | (e.g. seed policy, market<br>liberalisation,<br>protectionism, monopoly  | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$   |              |
| Legal and                    | – No office of testing  | of incumbent technology)<br>– Establish regulatory   |              |              |                |              |
| regulatory                   | and certification   | agency for standards,<br>testing and certification   | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$   | $\checkmark$ |
|                              |   | - Strengthen regulatory  |              |              |                |              |
|                              | - Import of cheaper,<br>inferior-quality                                | framework (e.g. implementation &   | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$   |              |
|                              | equipment/products  | penalty)<br>– Enhance networking for   |              |              |                |              |
| Network<br>structures        | professionals and<br>agencies weak and                                  | certified seed production/<br>improved drip irrigation /   |              |              | $\checkmark$   | $\checkmark$ |
| structures                   | agencies weak and ineffective   | improved drip irrigation / potato cultivation chain  |              | N            | N              | 'N           |

# Table 31: Summary of barriers and corresponding measures for micro-propagated production of clean, climate resilient Irish potato seed-tubers

|        |                     | actors.                  |              |              |              |              |
|--------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|        |                     | -Strengthen research,    |              |              |              |              |
|        |                     | development and          |              |              |              |              |
|        |                     | demonstration of new     |              |              |              |              |
|        |                     | technology               |              |              |              |              |
|        | – Farmers           | - Strengthen Cooperative |              |              |              |              |
|        | cooperatives        | Dep. and form an         |              |              |              |              |
|        | generally work in   | association of farmer's  | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$ |              |
|        | insolation (crop    | cooperatives             |              |              |              |              |
|        | specific)           |                          |              |              |              |              |
|        |                     | - Increase local and     |              |              |              |              |
|        | - Limited farmer to | regional farmer's        |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
|        | farmer visits       | networking               |              |              |              |              |
|        | - Limited awareness | – Establish management   |              |              |              |              |
|        | and knowledge of    | programme and            |              |              |              |              |
|        | new technology      | education/awareness      |              | 2            |              | 2            |
|        |                     | campaign among key       |              | v            |              | v            |
|        |                     | stakeholders for new     |              |              |              |              |
|        |                     | technology               |              |              |              |              |
|        | - Low technical     | – Establish training     |              |              |              |              |
| Others | capacity            | component in technology  |              | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$ |
|        |                     | diffusion programme      |              |              |              |              |
|        | – Farming           | - Through technology     |              |              |              |              |
|        | communities and     | diffusion programme      |              |              |              |              |
|        | farmers suspicious  | address social, cultural |              |              |              | N            |
|        | - afraid of change  | and behavioural issues;  |              | v            |              | v            |
|        |                     | improve KAP* among       |              |              |              |              |
|        |                     | users                    |              |              |              |              |

## 2.6 Linkages of the barriers identified

Table 10 is summary of the linkages of critical barriers per prioritized technology in the Agriculture Sector. These critical barriers were discussed in small, stakeholder's group meetings, and a couple were drawn directly from proceedings of several policy meetings in the Ministry of Agriculture in 2017. The tick marks indicate the barrier linkages among the proposed technologies in the TNA process.

| B  | arriers   | Improved Drip<br>Irrigation /<br>Fertigation /<br>Water<br>Catchment | Grain production<br>of climate<br>resilient varieties<br>of Corn & Beans<br>seeds | Cooling System for<br>Crop Cover<br>Structure/Belhouses<br>/ Tropical<br>Greenhouses | In-country<br>micro-<br>propagation<br>of climate<br>resilient<br>Potato seeds |
|----|---|--|---|--|--|
| 1) | Inadequate and<br>incoherent policy<br>incentive<br>frameworks (e.g.<br>absence of a seed<br>policy)  | $\checkmark$   | $\checkmark$  |  | √  |
| 2) | Weak governance<br>systems and<br>mechanisms -<br>monitoring and<br>evaluation systems<br>are still in infancy<br>stages  |  | ~   | 1  | 1  |
| 3) | Regulations that<br>support contract<br>farming or provide<br>a fair operating<br>field for producers<br>and buyers not<br>available  |  | $\checkmark$  |  | 1  |
| 4) | Local market<br>opportunities are<br>limited; <i>centros de</i><br><i>acopio y servicio</i> -<br>buying agricultural<br>centres) not well<br>developed, still in<br>infancy |  | $\checkmark$  |  | 1  |
| 5) | Value Added<br>(additions) still in<br>its infancy among<br>small producers and<br>agro-processors  |  | $\checkmark$  |  | $\checkmark$   |
| 6) | Poor infrastructure,<br>including SPS,<br>standards, food<br>safety monitoring  | $\checkmark$   | $\checkmark$  | $\checkmark$   | 1  |
| 7) | Affordable credit<br>and financing not<br>easily accessible to<br>small producers   | 1  | $\checkmark$  | 1  | 1  |
| 8) | Low levels of<br>productivity and<br>high production<br>costs especially<br>fuel, agro-inputs   |  | $\checkmark$  |  | 1  |
| 9) | Limited research<br>and deficient   | 1  |   | 1  | $\checkmark$   |

 Table 32: Linkages of Barriers by Technologies in the Agricultural Sector

| extension services<br>to support rural |              |              |              |              |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| producers                              |              |              |              |              |
| 10) Limited                            |              | al           |              | d            |
|  | V            | Y            | V            | V            |
| 11) Limited resilience                 |              |              |              |              |
| 11) Limited festilence                 | al           | al           |              | al           |
| (including                             | Y            | Y            | v            | V            |
| economic downturn                      |              |              |              |              |
| or market volatility)                  |              |              |              |              |
| and natural                            |              |              |              |              |
| disasters (related to                  |              |              |              |              |
| climate variability                    |              |              |              |              |
| and change)                            |              |              |              |              |
| 12) High initial costs                 |              | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$ |
| 13) Weak political will                |              | ,            |              |              |
| and limited                            | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| subsidies/incentives                   | ·            |              |              |              |
| 14) Networking                         |              |              |              |              |
| among                                  |              |              |              |              |
| professionals and                      | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| agencies weak and                      |              |              |              |              |
| ineffective                            |              |              |              |              |
| 15) Gaps in                            |              |              |              |              |
| technology value                       | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$ |
| chain                                  |              |              |              |              |
| 16) No office of                       |              |              |              |              |
| testing and                            | .1           | .1           | .1           | .1           |
| certification for                      | ٧            | N            | N            | N            |
| agriculture                            |              |              |              |              |

## 2.7 Enabling framework for overcoming the barriers in the Agriculture Sector

The enabling framework that exists or will exist at the Ministry of Agriculture level to facilitate technology transfer in the Agriculture sector as outlined by stakeholders during the small group meetings were:

- 1. Technical cooperation and cooperation with regional institutions such as: CARDI, IICA, INFAP, Mexican Scientific and Technical Cooperation (AMEXCID).
- 2. Present initiatives of MOA to strengthen its Research and Extension Service including greater emphasis in the use of information and communication technology (ICT) in agriculture.
- 3. The Ministry's initiative, with the collaboration of IDB, to improve and systematize its agriculture data and information in a way that is readily accessible for decision making.

- 4. Technical cooperation projects being pursued or will be pursued with FAO, CDB, IFAD, etc.
- 5. Adoption of a National Agriculture and Food Policy 2015-2030, and the drafting and adoption of an updated Agriculture Development, Management and Operational Strategy (ADMOS), that will both help to steer sustainable agricultural development in Belize for the short and medium term.
- 6. Climate Smart Agriculture initiative.

Measures at the technical level to attain the stated objectives were analysed with Problem and Solution trees that help to identify a strategic pathway to solve the focal problem and facilitate the transfer of the said technologies.

Table 32 is a matrix of the enabling framework to facilitate the transfer of the prioritized technologies in the Agriculture sector. It considers solutions to the key barriers identified during the consultative process that are current with the short/medium term.

| Table 33: Enabling | framework for | overcoming  | barriers f | or technology | transfer in the | <b>Agriculture Set</b> | ector |
|--------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|-------|
|                    |               | 0,01,00,000 | ~~~~~~~~~  |               |                 |                        |       |

| Barriers                     | Measures                               | Results                   | Timeframe           | Estimated Cost              |
|------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1) Inadequate and            | - MOA will review and update           | - Facilitates the         | Medium to long term |                             |
| incoherent policy incentive  | policies & strategic plan of action to | implementation and        |                     | Initial Cost:               |
| a seed policy)               | address gaps and needs for             | success of TNA            |                     | GOB in kind contribution    |
| a seed poney)                | sustainable agriculture production     | prioritized technologies  |                     |                             |
|                              | - MOA in coordination with local &     | for Agriculture.          |                     | Operational cost:           |
|                              | regional partners will conduct         | - Common goal improves    |                     | GOB in kind contribution    |
|                              | regular and systematic training to     | cooperation and trust     |                     | to facilitate technology    |
|                              | upgrade institutional and technical    | among partners            |                     | transfer. Project capital   |
|                              | capacity                               |                           |                     | financing covers greater    |
|                              |  |                           |                     | cost of training            |
| 2) Weak governance           | - MOA & partners including UB          | - Professional services   | Medium/Long term    |                             |
| systems and mechanisms       | will implement technology transfer     | offered to farmers and    |                     | Cost of this intervention   |
| 3) Monitoring and            | programme by which Extension           | farming cooperatives;     |                     | is attributed to the nature |
| evaluation systems are still | Services/Lab facilities will be        | - Scientifically compiled |                     | of the IDB grant or loan    |
| in infancy stages            | strengthened with specialized experts  | and verified agriculture  |                     | to GOB/                     |
|                              | and personnel.                         | data to inform policies,  |                     |                             |
|                              | - Intervention is underway and will    | decisions makers and      |                     |                             |
|                              | continue to improve and systematize    | stakeholders.             |                     |                             |
|                              | agriculture database and information   | - Reasonable and          |                     |                             |
|                              | with support from IDB.                 | measurable indicators     |                     |                             |
|                              |  | developed to measure      |                     |                             |
|                              |  | impacts of TNA project    |                     |                             |
|                              |  | implementation and        |                     |                             |
|                              |  | success.                  |                     |                             |
|                              |  |                           |                     |                             |
|                              |  |                           |                     |                             |

| 4) Regulations that          | - Draft and adopt supporting contract   | - Minimizes miss-trust,      | Short/Medium term |                             |
|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| support contract farming or  | farming policies, which will provide    | conflicts and animosity;     |                   | Initial cost: GOB in-kind   |
| provide a fair operating     | a fair operating field for producers    | - Establishes a just and     |                   | contribution and is part of |
| field for producers and      | and buyers.                             | more equitable market        |                   | its social contract with    |
| buyers not available         | -                                       | environment for              |                   | producers and consumers     |
|                              |   | producers/small farmers      |                   |                             |
|                              |   | and buyers.                  |                   |                             |
|                              |   | - Stimulates the economy,    |                   |                             |
|                              |   | keep dollars at home, and    |                   |                             |
|                              |   | benefits the small farmers   |                   |                             |
| 5) Local market              | - Review and adopt policies and         | - Market demands             | Medium/Long term  |                             |
| opportunities are limited;   | regulations to facilitate local Market  | satisfied; increased agro-   |                   | GOB driven initiative.      |
| (buying agricultural         | opportunities for producers and         | processing and added         |                   | GOB in kind contribution    |
| centres) not well            | buyers.                                 | value industries; reduced    |                   | to facilitate technologies  |
| developed, still in infancy. | -                                       | importation of potato, for   |                   | that are increasing         |
|                              |   | example.                     |                   | agricultural yields.        |
|                              |   | - Farmers get a better price |                   |                             |
|                              |   | for their produce.           |                   |                             |
|                              |   | - GOB heightens its          |                   |                             |
|                              |   | protection of small          |                   |                             |
|                              |   | producers                    |                   |                             |
| 6) Value Added               | - Lobby and advance political will      | - Farmers have resources     | Medium term       |                             |
| (additions) still in its     | and budget allocation for programs to   | for curing/storage of        |                   | Cost will depend on         |
| infancy among small          | build climate resilient agro-industries | grains and potato;           |                   | Objective and actions and   |
| producers and agro-          | based on 'Value Added' of local         | - Increased income for       |                   | extent of intervention.     |
| processors.                  | produce including: grains, potato,      | farmers; stimulates local    |                   | Funding will be from        |
|                              | and equipment for tropical              | economy;                     |                   | both local and              |
|                              | greenhouses/Belhouses, and              | - increase technical skills  |                   | international sources.      |

|   | components for water harvesting;<br>fertigation, drip irrigation and Solar<br>PV.<br>-  | and job opportunities.<br>- increase food security;<br>- Increase adaptation to<br>Climate Change   |                  |   |
|---|---|---|------------------|---|
| <ul> <li>7) Poor infrastructure,<br/>including Supply,</li> <li>Packaging and Storage<br/>(SPS); issues with sanitary<br/>and phytosanitary<br/>standards; inadequate food<br/>safety monitoring, etc.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Funding will be identified and<br/>procured for upgrading/ enhancing<br/>infrastructure including SPS,<br/>sanitary and phytosanitary standards,<br/>and increased food safety monitoring</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Belize easily meets the requirements for export of its agriculture products</li> <li>Increased R&amp;D programme under controlled facilities</li> <li>Facilities at BAHA upgraded to test imported grain and potato 'breeder' seeds.</li> </ul>  | Medium term      | Costs: GOB allocation<br>for improved Agriculture<br>infrastructure   |
| 8) Affordable credit and<br>financing not easily<br>accessible to medium and<br>small-scale producers.  | - Affordable low-interest credits and<br>financing will be made accessible for<br>small producers interested to invest<br>in improved drip<br>irrigation/fertigation systems;<br>redesigned and cooler protective<br>covered structures; and climate<br>resilient, 'certified' grain and potato<br>seeds. | <ul> <li>Farmers invest in<br/>improved technologies<br/>and benefit from<br/>increased yields and<br/>economic returns.</li> <li>Increased in technical<br/>capacity of Extension<br/>Service personnel, R&amp;D<br/>staff and technicians.</li> <li>Improved livelihood<br/>security for farmers</li> </ul> | Medium/Long term | Cost: TNA prioritized<br>technologies cumulative<br>costs (See factsheets for<br>an estimate).<br>GOB in kind contribution<br>through services and<br>training of Extension<br>Service personnel and<br>technicians |

| 9) Low levels of           | - Request for a reduction in the       | - Increased in vestments   | Short/Medium term    |                            |
|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| productivity and high      | import duties for equipment            | on improved agriculture    |                      | GOB intervention to        |
| input/ production costs    | components related to agriculture      | technology.                |                      | facilitate technology      |
| especially fuel, agro-     | technology transfer                    | - Increased productivity   |                      | transfer and increased     |
| inputs, imported           | - Request tax exception or reduction   | in climate resilient crops |                      | production for local,      |
| equipment/spares           | for spares/components of agriculture   | (grains, potato,           |                      | regional and international |
|                            | equipment and improved technology      | horticulture, etc.).       |                      | markets.                   |
|                            | hardware                               | - Reduced input cost for   |                      |                            |
|                            |  | small farmers, increased   |                      |                            |
|                            |  | yields and profits.        |                      |                            |
| 10) Limited research and   | - Strengthen R&D and Extension         | - Increased use of ICT in  | Short /Medium term   | Initial cost:              |
| development, and deficient | Services, putting greater emphasis in  | agriculture to provide     |                      |                            |
| extension services to      | the use of Information                 | farmers with: i) timely    |                      | US\$ 80,000.00             |
| support rural producers    | Communication and Technology           | and relevant information;  |                      |                            |
|                            | (ICT)                                  | ii) access to credit; and  |                      |                            |
|                            | - Develop a revolving fund for R&D,    | changing/better market     |                      |                            |
|                            | with seed money procured from          | prices                     |                      |                            |
|                            | Local/Regional/International           | - Improved farming         |                      |                            |
|                            | sources.                               | systems, increased yields, |                      |                            |
|                            |  | and reduce                 |                      |                            |
|                            |  | environmental impacts      |                      |                            |
| 11) Limited technologies   | - Procure finance for prioritized TNA  | - Increased capacity and   | Short to Medium term | The costs are multiple     |
| and usage                  | project technologies in climate        | institutional              |                      | and depend on the          |
|                            | change adaptation from local,          | strengthening in the       |                      | specific interventions     |
|                            | regional and international sources as  | Agriculture Sector;        |                      | being considered and/or    |
|                            | opportunities are identified and acted | - Increased job            |                      | implemented.               |
|                            | upon.                                  | opportunities;             |                      |                            |
|                            | -                                      | - Improved yields;         |                      |                            |
|                            |  | - Increased economic       |                      |                            |

| 12) Limited resilience<br>capacity to risks (including  | <ul> <li>Increase knowledge, capacity and resources of stakeholders and</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>benefits for farmers;</li> <li>Reduced food insecurity;</li> <li>Will contribute to<br/>achieving MDG # 8.</li> <li>Increased resilience to<br/>climate change impacts</li> </ul>  | Short/Medium term | Costs to increased multi-<br>peril resilience must be   |
|---|--|---|-------------------|---|
| economic downturn or<br>market volatility) and<br>natural disasters (related to<br>climate variability and<br>change) | <ul> <li>farmers to build resilience and<br/>enhance their livelihood.</li> <li>Establish a risk transfer<br/>mechanism/multi-peril crop<br/>insurance scheme to cover losses due<br/>to extreme events and market<br/>volatility.</li> <li>Increased crop diversification among<br/>farmers that are engaged in<br/>cultivation of only staples or<br/>traditional crops</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>among small farmers;</li> <li>Disaster risk reduction<br/>enhanced among farmers,<br/>who can easily recover<br/>from the impacts of<br/>extreme climatic events,<br/>poor yields, and market<br/>volatility.</li> </ul> |                   | borne by GOB through<br>multi-interventions,<br>procuring seed money for<br>a revolving risk transfer<br>programme, and in-kind<br>contribution for DRR in<br>the Agriculture Sector. |
| 13) High initial costs for<br>new and improved<br>technology  | <ul> <li>Reduced import duties and taxes on<br/>hardware and spares/components for<br/>Agriculture technology transfer.</li> <li>Procure finance from multiple<br/>sources to offset high initial costs</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>New and improved<br/>agriculture adaptation<br/>technologies pilots<br/>implemented.</li> </ul>  | Short/Medium term | Cost are multiple and<br>technology specific. See<br>factsheets for a<br>preliminary estimate per<br>technology   |
| 14) Weak political will<br>and limited subsidies /<br>incentives for small<br>farmers                                 | <ul> <li>Partners and stakeholder adocate for<br/>increased action from area<br/>representative</li> <li>Lobby for reduced import duties;</li> <li>increase market opportunities for<br/>farmers</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Policymakers and Area<br/>Representatives on the<br/>side of small farmers</li> <li>Increased investments in<br/>new and improved<br/>technology</li> </ul>  | Short/Medium term | Cost of advocacy borne<br>by local farmers groups,<br>partners in Agriculture,<br>the private sector, NGOs,<br>and others.<br>GOB absorbs cost for                                    |

|                              | -                                     | - Farmers get a better price |                      | financial                   |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
|                              |                                       | for their products           |                      | incentive/subsidy.          |
|                              |                                       |                              |                      |                             |
| 15) Institutional conflicts  | - Ungrade MOA human resources         | - Enhanced professional      | Short/Medium Term    | Initial cost: Minimal       |
| and overlapping roles (turf  | programme for efficient and           | - Emilanced professional     |                      | MOA can coordinate this     |
| protection)                  | affective cooperation and resources   | MOA and key national         |                      | offort among kay            |
| protection                   | utilization                           | regional and international   |                      | stakeholders in the public  |
|                              | utilization.                          |                              |                      | and private sectors and at  |
|                              | - Strengthen partnersmps and identify | agencies.                    |                      | and private sectors, and at |
|                              | common goals among key Agencies       | - Increased trust among      |                      | the Regional and            |
|                              | in the Sector.                        | farmers and MOA, and         |                      | International levels        |
|                              | -                                     | other private sector         |                      |                             |
|                              |                                       | entities.                    |                      |                             |
| 16) Non-enforcement of       | - Ensure the implementation of the    | - Increased training of      | Short to Medium term | Initial cost for proposed   |
| the Land Use Policy          | Agriculture and Food Policy 2015-     | farmers biodiversity         |                      | six improved drip           |
| creating an inbalance in the | 2030 which addresses climate          | conservation and water       |                      | irrigation / fertigation    |
| ecosystem and impacting      | change impacts and integrated water   | management in                |                      | systems with RE             |
| on biodiversity              | resources management in               | watersheds                   |                      | component for pilot         |
|                              | agriculture, and biodiversity         | - Improved drip irrigation   |                      | demonstration and           |
|                              | conservation.                         | / fertigation system         |                      | training is:                |
|                              | - Strenghten the Water Resources and  | technology help reduce       |                      | US \$ 126,800               |
|                              | Climate Change Unit in the MOA.       | the impact on                |                      | Operating cost per          |
|                              | _                                     | biodiversity and             |                      | annum:                      |
|                              |                                       | increased, unsustainable     |                      | US\$ 45,000                 |
|                              |                                       | land use                     |                      |                             |
|                              |                                       | - Improved water             |                      |                             |
|                              |                                       | resources management         |                      |                             |
|                              |                                       | and increased yields         |                      |                             |

| 17) Knowledge, Attitude,   | - Synergize the Water Resources and | - Climate Smart          | Medium term | Initial Cost:  |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| Perception (KAP) on the    | Climate Change Unit with the        | Agriculture Country      |             |                |
| impacts of Climate Change  | Extension Services to conduct       | Profile is being         |             | US\$ 80,000.00 |
| among farmers is generally | education and outreach to farmers.  | conducted for Belize     |             |                |
| below average              |                                     | under a World Bank       |             |                |
|                            |                                     | funded project (2018).   |             |                |
|                            |                                     | - Expanded knowledge and |             |                |
|                            |                                     | positive attitude and    |             |                |
|                            |                                     | perceptions of the       |             |                |
|                            |                                     | impacts of Climate       |             |                |
|                            |                                     | Change among farming     |             |                |
|                            |                                     | communities.             |             |                |

#### 3.1 Preliminary targets for technology transfer and diffusion

One of Belize's natural and greatest assets is its coastal zone (CZMAI, 2014). About 30 % of Belize's gross domestic product is directly linked to commercial activities inside its coastal zone (Cho 2005 in CZMAI, 2014). Belize's coastal zone also has important social and cultural values for its people, considering that about 40% of the population resides along the coast and offshore areas (Statistical Institute of Belize, 2010). The past decades have seen rapid economic development and population growth within the coastal zone and inland regions of Belize. Consequently, this has led to increasing pressures on coastal and marine resources, directly affecting the livelihood of stakeholders that depend on these resources.

There is scientific consensus that the changes induced by global warming and climate change are already evident and will intensify in the future (IPCC, 2007; USAID, 2014). The effects of climate change will continue to significantly alter coastal ecosystems, coastal hazards, and lifestyle changes for fishers, coastal resource users, waterfront property owners and coastal communities. These changes will have far-reaching consequences on the marine environment and will pose complex challenges for coastal resource managers. As a result, multi-sectoral and integrated efforts are required to guide proactive adaptation actions that can benefit human and natural ecosystems for present and future generations (USAID, 2014).

The ability of marine ecosystems and habitats to adapt to climate impacts can be increased by reducing other stressors such as overfishing, land-based pollution and misguided land use changes (CZMAI, 2014). Regulating and reducing these stresses will increase the resilience or ability of the environment to adapt to future impacts, thus reducing threats to human welfare.

Increasing the capacity of the Fisheries Department to monitor and evaluate the physical and anthropogenic-related changes and impacts in the coastal and marine ecosystem, is important in improving the management of coastal and marine resources. The proposed technology transfer of an upgraded coastal zone monitoring network and Early Warning System is an essential component to this end.

Table 33 below is a summary of technology targets for the coastal and marine sector and the benefits versus costs.

| Sector:  | Targets /  | Too Ambitious or   | Conservative  |
|--|--|--|---|
| Technologies   | beneficiaries  | not  |   |
| Coastal & Marine   |  |  |   |
| Coastal & Marine I. Marine Environmental Monitoring Network & Early Warning System | -Fishers and<br>fishing<br>communities;<br>-Tourism sector<br>and coastal<br>developers;<br>-Other<br>communities;<br>-light industries<br>and infra-<br>structure<br>integrity<br>-partners in<br>CZM | -Not necessarily<br>so. The benefits<br>can be directly or<br>indirectly far<br>reaching. The<br>coastal zone is a<br>vital economic<br>zone and home to<br>just over 40% of<br>the country's<br>population.<br>Also, about 30%<br>or more of GDP is<br>directly linked to<br>commercial<br>activities in the<br>coastal zone, | Yes. The benefits of<br>establishing a<br>modern and reliable<br>environmental<br>monitoring network<br>and marine early<br>warning system for<br>the coastal and<br>marine environment<br>far out weighs the<br>costs.<br>The preliminary<br>costs for<br>establishing and<br>operating the<br>monitoring network<br>and early warning<br>system with proper<br>communication<br>system and other<br>components is: US\$<br>177,965.33.<br>Operational cost for<br>five years US\$<br>84,491.34. |
|  |  |  |   |

#### Table 34: summary of technology targets for the coastal and marine sector

# **3.2** Barrier analysis and possible enabling measures for Belize's Coastal Zone monitoring network and Early Warning System

Some critical barriers identified by stakeholders during the working sessions held at the Fisheries Department conference facility, that can restrict the implementation of an effective, environmental coastal and marine monitoring network and early warning system include:

- The lack of an integrated, strategic environmental monitoring and evaluation plan and early warning system for the coastal and marine zone.
- High cost of marine monitoring platforms and deployment.
- High operational and maintenance costs.
- Lack of cost-benefit analysis to highlight the advantages for establishment an effective marine environmental monitoring network, and early warning for stakeholders.
- None-existing national policies to monitor impacts of current agricultural and touristcentric development practices to ensure viable Zone of Influence (ZOI) to the coastal zone.
- Increasing threat to marine and coastal zone resources and use.
- Failure in many instances to follow the coastal zone management plan (GOB/GEO, 2010).
- Limited long-term research in coastal communities.
- Limited enforcement of national regulations to protect coastal resources.
- Variable or limited knowledge of the impacts of climate change on marine ecosystems.
- Lack of historic and current oceanographic/marine resources database.
- Inadequate, high-capacity human resources.
- Lack of effective synergy and coordinated work programme with other key agencies/departments/ministries/NGO/communities in coastal zone management.
- Lack of adequate finance for effective regulatory and enforcement mandate and R&D.
- Institutional capacity for the sector have room for improvement.
- Weak coordination and cooperation with developers and key stakeholders in implementation and compliance of fisheries regulations, and coastal zone management programmes.
- Limited resilience capacity to risks (including economic downturn or market volatility) and natural disasters (related to climate variability and change).
- Illegal fishing and resource extraction common.
- Failure to establish and maintain credibility with public evident at times.
- Implementing same old strategies and expecting different results.
- The impacts of climate change coupled with anthropogenic stressors not fully understood by majority of stakeholders.
- Restrictive/weak coordination among regulating agencies/departments/ministries / NGOs / communities in the coastal zone

# Selection and decomposition of critical barriers for transfer of technology for a Marine environmental monitoring network and early warning system

Table 34 is a summary of the selection of critical and crucial barriers to the transfer and diffusion of the technology to develop an effective, environmental marine monitoring systems and early warning system, based upon criteria on a Likert scale, and their importance. Table 35 shows a simple decomposition of the killer and crucial barriers identified during the selection process.

| No. | Barriers              | Criteria and Importance of Barriers for Technology 2 |         |           |           |                |      |
|-----|-----------------------|--|---------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------|
|     | Economic &            | 1. Critical  | 2.      | 3.        | 4.        | 5.             |      |
|     | Financial             | (killer,   | Crucial | Important | Less      | Insignificant  | Rank |
|     |                       | non-starter)   |         |           | important | (easy starter) |      |
| 1   | - High Initial costs  | Х  |         |           |           |                | 1    |
|     | for procuring and     |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | establishing a fully  |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | operational marine    |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | monitoring            |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | platforms and         |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | deployment            |  |         |           |           |                |      |
| 2   | - Lack of an          | Х  |         |           |           |                | 1    |
|     | integrated,           |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | strategic             |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | environmental         |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | monitoring and        |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | evaluation plan       |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | and early             |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | warning system        |  |         |           |           |                |      |
| 3   | - Credits and limited |  |         | Х         |           |                | 3    |
|     | low-interest          |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | financing, and non-   |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | favourable payment    |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | plans                 |  |         |           |           |                |      |
| 4   | - High import taxes   |  | Х       |           |           |                | 2    |
|     | and limited           |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | subsidies             |  |         |           |           |                |      |
| 5   | - High operational    | х  |         |           |           |                | 1    |
|     | and maintenance       |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | costs                 |  |         |           |           |                |      |
| 6   | - Elevated financial  |  | X       |           |           |                | 2    |
|     | risks to programme    |  |         |           |           |                |      |
|     | due to vandalism      |  |         |           |           |                |      |

## Table 35: Criteria and Importance of barriers impeding the transfer of technology for a marine environmental monitoring network and early warning system

|   | and praedial         |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
|   | larceny              |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7 | - Elevated financial |   |   | Х |   | 3 |
|   | risks to programme   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | due to extreme       |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | climatic event       |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8 | - Foreign exchange   |   |   |   | Х | 4 |
|   | and corresponding    |   |   |   |   |   |
| 0 |                      |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9 | - Lack of cost-      |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | benefit analysis     |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | to highlight the     |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | advantages for       |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | establishment of     |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | an effective         |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | marine               |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | environmental        |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | monitoring           |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | network, and         |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | early warning        |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | - Lack of            |   |   | Х |   | 3 |
|   | adequate finance     |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | for effective        |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | regulatory and       |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | enforcement          |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | mandate and          |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | R&D                  |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | Non-financial        |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | - Limited            | х |   |   |   | 1 |
|   | environmental        |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | monitoring and       |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | enforcement in the   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | face of increasing   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | threat to marine     |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | and coastal zone     |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | resources and use    |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | - None-existing      |   | x |   |   | 2 |
|   | national policies    |   |   |   |   | _ |
|   | to monitor           |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | impacts of           |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | current              |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |                      |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | agricultural and     |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | tourist-centric      |   |   |   |   |   |

|    | development         |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7  | - Illegal fishing   |   |   | Х |   |   | 3 |
|    | and resource        |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | extraction          |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | common              |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8  | - Weak co-          |   |   |   | Х |   | 4 |
|    | ordination and      |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | cooperation with    |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | developers/key      |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | stakeholders in     |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | implementation      |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | and compliance      |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | of fisheries        |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | regulations         |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9  | - Limited subsidies |   | X |   |   |   | 2 |
|    | and incentives      |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 10 | - Institutional     |   | Х |   |   |   | 2 |
|    | capacity of         |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | regulating          |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | agencies need       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | strengthening       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 11 | - Restrictive/weak  |   | X |   |   |   | 2 |
|    | coordination among  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | regulating          |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | agencies/departm    |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | ents/ministries /   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | NGOs /              |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | communities in      |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | the coastal zone    |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 12 | - Limited technical |   | X |   |   |   | 2 |
| 13 | - Pising fuel costs |   |   | v |   |   | 2 |
| 13 | - Kising fuel costs |   |   | X |   |   | 2 |
| 17 | instances to        |   |   | А |   |   | 5 |
|    | follow the          |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | coastal zone        |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | coastal zone        |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | nlan                |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|    | Imported            |   | v |   |   |   | 2 |
|    | - imported          |   | X |   |   |   | L |
|    | the best quality    |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | the best quality    | 1 | 1 |   |   | 1 |   |

 Table 36: Selection of killer or non-starter barriers for technology transfer of a marine environmental monitoring network and early warning system

| Category of             | 1. Critical (killer,   | 2. Crucial   | Elements of killer   | Dimension of   |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Barriers                | non-starter)   |  | or non-starters  | barrier elements   |
|                         |  |  |  |  |
| Economic &<br>Financial | <ul> <li>High Initial costs<br/>for procuring and<br/>establishing a<br/>fully operational<br/>marine monitoring<br/>platforms and<br/>deployment.</li> <li>High operational<br/>&amp; maintenance<br/>costs.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>High import taxes<br/>and limited subsidies</li> <li>Elevated financial<br/>risks to programme<br/>due to vandalism and<br/>praedial larceny</li> <li>Rising fuel prices</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>High interest<br/>rates</li> <li>High import<br/>duties of<br/>components</li> <li>Elevated cost of<br/>specialized<br/>technical services</li> <li>High cost for<br/>technical services</li> <li>Funds for spares<br/>and components<br/>may be in<br/>accessible</li> <li>Risk costs arising<br/>from vandalism,<br/>praedial larcerny<br/>and natural<br/>hazards may be<br/>high</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>12 – 15 % on<br/>certain components</li> <li>Service cost could<br/>be as high as 15 %<br/>of capital cost</li> <li>Interest rates could<br/>be 6 to 12 % per<br/>annum</li> <li>Specialized<br/>technical service<br/>providers/personnel<br/>not available locally</li> <li>Elevated costs to<br/>upgrade sensors and<br/>communication<br/>system</li> <li>No insurance or a<br/>lack of a risk<br/>transfer nechanism.</li> </ul> |
| Market                  | -  | - Imported equipment   | - Unsatisfactory   | - Field trials in the  |
| failures                |  | not of the best<br>quality.  | <ul> <li>procurement<br/>practices</li> <li>Bad experience<br/>with mal-<br/>functioning<br/>system</li> <li>Supply greater<br/>than demands</li> <li>Inaccessibility to<br/>spares</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>tropical marine</li> <li>environment not</li> <li>rigorous</li> <li>Costly equipment</li> <li>not necessarily the</li> <li>best in the market</li> <li>Poor maintenance</li> <li>Indequate designed</li> <li>sensors</li> </ul>   |
| Non-                    | - Limited  | - Institutional  | - Limited  | Resource depletion   |
| financial               | environmental<br>monitoring and<br>enforcement in  | capacity of<br>regulating agencies<br>need strengthening   | enforcement<br>- Increase<br>encroughment and  | <ul> <li>Less income for<br/>stakeholders</li> </ul>   |

| the face of      | - Limited subsidies and | illegal fishing    | - Undersize catch    |
|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| increasing       | incentives              | - Illegal dredging | -                    |
| threat to marine | - Restrictive/weak      | and indiscriminate | -                    |
| and coastal      | coordination among      | development        | -                    |
| zone resources   | regulating agencies /   | - Decreasing catch | -                    |
| zone resources   | departments/ministri    | -                  | -                    |
| and use.         | es/ NOGs /              | - Increased        | - Poor water quality |
| - Incoherent     | communities in the      | pollution          | - Die back and       |
| environmental    | coastal zone.           | - Coral reef       | negative impacts on  |
| monitoring and   | - None-existing         | bleaching          | marine ecosystems    |
| evaluation plan  | national policies to    | - Limited          | - Early warning and  |
| & early warning  | monitor impacts of      | monitoring and     | advisories not       |
| system.          | current agricultural    | interaction        | coordinated and      |
| -                | and tourist contria     |                    | disseminated on a    |
|                  | and tourist-centric     |                    | timely basis         |
|                  | development             |                    |                      |
|                  | -                       |                    |                      |

Enabling environment elements were listed by the working groups in order of importance as follow:

- The Fisheries Department, CZMAI, and local NGOs have extensive experience working in the Belize Coastal Zone.
- Some institutional capacity exists.
- Increase in national and regional scientific research and access to research results.
- Both Fisheries Department and CZMAI are executing sustainable fisheries and climate change projects, such as the MCCAP and the Estuarine Water Quality Monitoring.
- The recently adopted National Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan for Belize: Creating a Blueprint for Sustainable Coastal Resources Use" (CZMAI, 2016), provides a framework and guidance for sustainable use of marine resources.
- The Tourism Sector and other related productive sub sectors in the Coastal Zone are vitally important to the economic development of the country. Industries in the Coastal Zone contributed about 60% to GDP in 2016.
- Belize's Barrier Reef (the largest proportion of the Meso-American Barrier Reef System) is a critical national assess, and a habitat for numerous marine species.
- Fishery is the livelihood of thousands of Belizeans and must continue to be managed sustainably.
- Legal framework empowers Fisheries Department and the CZMAI to regulate and manage resource uptake and sustainable development enterprise in the Coastal Zone.
- Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and No-Take-Zone are now being respected and observed by stakeholders.

- Fairly good communication exists in the Coastal Zone.
- Fisheries and co-management NGOs/University of Belize already have some establish monitoring sites...Calabash Caye, South Water Caye, Hol Chan Marine Reserve, Half Moon Caye, Gladdens Spit, to name a few.
- Belize Coast Guard has a foreword base near Belize City, and operational centres in several localities in the coastal zone.
- Tax exemption in place for importation of Government-commission, scientific, marine monitoring equipment.
- <u>Environmental advocacy</u> has played an important in campaigning for policies and management strategies that focus on balancing the needs of various industries and sustaining the health of the costal zone (State of the Belize Coastal Zone: 2003-2013, CZMAI, 2014).

# **3.2.1** General description of Belize's Coastal Zone monitoring network and Early Warning System

The Coastal Zone is vitally important for productive sectors such as Fisheries, Tourism, Transport, Commerce, recreational fishing and adventure, and livelihood security of coastal communities, to name a few. The marine resources and ecosystem services are threatened by anthropogenic activities and climate change, which directly or indirectly impact stakeholders such as fishers and their families, other coastal communities, and stakeholders in general. The Coastal Zone Management Authority and Institute (CZMAI) supports the efforts of the Fisheries Department in trying to upgrade its marine environmental monitoring network, to gather baseline data for its Marine Early Warning program.

As Global Warming intensifies and the effects of climate change overshadows natural climate variability, the marine ecosystem will experience increasing ocean acidification and thermal stress which will continue to impact coral reefs around the world and the Caribbean, resulting in more coral bleaching events and marine ecosystem disruption (NOAA/CCCCC, 2012). It is therefore critical to systematically monitor the various parameters that impact the coral reefs in Belize, complimenting and supporting the NOAA/CCCCC Caribbean Coral Reef Early Warning System (CREWS) network and the Fisheries Department/CZMAI Marine Conservation and Climate Change Adaptation Project (MCCAP), *Component 1: Improving the protection regime of marine and coastal ecosystems*. Reliable environmental early warning systems improve climate risk planning, management and action, and are necessary to address the impacts of Climate Change, especially coral bleaching and fish stock migration and influx/control of invasive species.

The threats to the coastal zone arise from a number of activities connected with tourism and recreational facilities, increase in population and urban expansion, utility supply, dredging and minerals extraction, land clearance and mangrove deforestation, pollution, waste disposal, fisheries/illegal fishing and aquaculture, and agriculture runoff (CZMAI, 2014).

Some pollution and ecosystem health indicators in the marine environment are: Water Clarity, Total Dissolved Oxygen, Coastal Wetland Loss, Eutrophic Condition, Sediment Contamination, Benthic Index, Fish Tissue Contaminants, Manatee and Fish Kill, and Multiple Marine Ecological Disturbances (e.g. coastline erosion rates, coastline retreat, sea level rise, etc.) (Guefact, 2007).

Earlier in 2016 the Government of Belize adopted the "National Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan (ICZMP) for Belize: Creating a Blueprint for Sustainable Coastal Resources Use" (CZMAI, 2016). The Framework of the Plan consists of four (4) Strategic Objectives, namely:

- **1.** To ensure the sustainable use of resources within the coastal zone.
- 2. To support integrate planning and management.
- 3. To build alliances for the benefit of Belizeans; and
- 4. To manage and adapt to climate change.

Some actions under the strategic objectives that addresses coastal/marine environment and ecosystem viability, and early warning related directly or indirectly to the effects of climate change are:

- 1.1 Coastal Research and Monitoring,
- 1.2 Coastal Habitat and Species Conservation,
- 2.2 Coastal Vulnerability,
- 3.1 Education, Awareness and Communication,
- 3.2 Collaboration in Enforcement and Monitoring,
- 3.4 A National Network for Managing the Coast,
- 4.1 Socio-ecological Vulnerability and Resilience, and
- 4.3 Prioritization of Ecosystem-based Adaptation.

The Belize Fisheries Department in the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, the Environment and Sustainable Development (MAFFESD), in collaboration with the Coastal Zone Management Authority & Institute (CZMAI) is implementing the five-year Marine Conservation and Climate Change Adaptation Project (MCCAP Fisheries Dep, 2014).

The project has four components, specifically:

Component 1: Improving the protection regime of marine and coastal ecosystems; Component 2: Promotion of viable alternative livelihoods; Component 3: Raising awareness and building local capacity; Component 4: Project Management, Monitoring and Assessment

Under component 1, the CZMAI has installed a network of nine marine and riverine climate and environmental monitoring platforms in the lower Belize River watershed and estuary to

record near real-time river and marine water quality and other environmental parameters, to assess critical levels of environmental stress and pollution on sensitive marine ecosystems in the area. The data will be used along with other information to inform decision-making and management strategies.

The Belize Fisheries Department was partner with the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC) and the University of Belize (UB) in the U.S. funded National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration's Coral Reef Early Warning System (CREWS) initiative for the Caribbean Region. Under this project, two Satellite-transmitting environmental and marine platforms were installed at Belize's Calabash Caye in the southern Turneffe Atoll and South Water Caye in the Glovers Reef Atoll back in late 2010. However, these marine observation platforms only functioned for less than two years; thereafter the onboard sensors began mal-functioning, and data recording and acquisition stopped. Maintenance of these monitoring platforms was not conducted as scheduled and the marine environmental network fell into disrepair and CREWS monitoring programme in Belize ended.

The Fisheries Department proposes to upgrade their Marine Monitoring and Early Warning System of Belize as a means to reduce the negative impacts of climate change on sensitive marine ecosystems and contribute to the sustainable use and management of marine resources.

The State of the Belize Coastal Zone 2003-2013 Report (CZMAI, 2014) made a number of recommendations with respect to the effects of climate change on coastal and marine ecosystems. These included the strengthening of the environmental and marine network; conduct quantitative vulnerability studies of the coastal zone using historic and current data; use results from studies and near real-time observations to develop early warning for climate and anthropogenic impacts on marine ecosystems; and draft policy recommendations to reduce the projected impacts of climate change.

Under the TNA-Belize project, the Fisheries Department is proposing the climate change adaptation technology for the Coastal and Marine sector: "Improved Marine Monitoring Network and Early Warning System for Belize's Coastal Zone to Increase Resilience to Climate Change".

The technology transfer will consist of the following:

1. Eight automatic environmental/marine observation platforms (e.g. YSI EXO 2 Sonde) with sensors to record: depth (tidal fluctuation), sea water temperature, pH/ORP (Oxidation/Reduction Potential), salinity, conductivity, turbidity, dissolved oxygen and Chlorophyll. Additional above water sensors will be installed to record air

temperature, surface wind speed and direction, rainfall, relative humidity, and solar radiation.

- 2. Eight loggers with transmission facility via smart phone technology.
- 3. Eight Photo Voltaic solar power equipment to generate, store and energize the observation platforms.
- 4. Quarterly water quality sampling at four strategic sites for laboratory analysis of nitrates/nitrogen, phosphates, Faecal Coliform, E-coli, Total Bacteria, etc. during the proposed five years of the project cycle.
- 5. Develop protocol to retrieve, quality check, archive, and process/analyse data and information for Early Warning Bulletins for stakeholders, including policymakers.
- 6. Maintain updated and accessible environmental and marine database for research and marine study, policy recommendation, management strategy and the annual State of the Belize Coastal Zone reports.

The GOB through the Fisheries Department will spearhead this intervention and the dissemination of information and regular 'early warning' bulletins among key stakeholders.

#### Supporting Department and Agencies in the Coastal and Marine Ecosystems Sector

The key stakeholders for the TNA adaptation intervention in the Coastal and Marine Ecosystem sector include: Fisheries Department, the Coastal Zone Management Authority and Institute (CZMAI), Fishing Cooperatives and members, the National Meteorological Service, Forest Department, NGOs working in the Coastal Zone, Tour Guide Companies, Belize Tourism Association, and Sea Taxi operators. The Marine Monitoring Network and Early Warning System will provide relevant and timely marine information and bulletins to stakeholders and decision-makers so they can operate safely and help in reducing the stress on marine ecosystems as a result of climate change impacts and other stressors.

#### Fisheries Department

The Belize Fisheries Department in the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry, the Environment and Sustainable Development (MAFFESD) is responsible for conservation and sustainable use of fishery resources, registration and licenses, fisheries research, education, liaise with fishing cooperatives, management of marine reserves, enforcement of fishing laws and regulations, export and research permits.

The Fisheries Unit Laboratory became a Department in 1987. The establishment and management of the Fisheries Department is legally facilitated through the Fisheries Act of 1977 and its subsidiary regulations.

Ongoing intervention is the five-year Belize Marine Conservation and Climate Adaptation Project (MCCAP), implemented by the World Bank and funded by an Adaptation Fund grant is the sum of US\$ 5.53 million, and US\$ 1.78 million in-kind contribution by the Government of Belize. The objective of the MCCAP is to implement priority ecosystem-based marine conservation and climate adaptation measures to strengthen the climate resilience of the Belize Barrier Reef System. The timeframe of the MCCAP is 2015-2020. The vision for the Fisheries Sector of Belize is captured in Figure xxx, as illustrated in the 2012 draft of the Economic Alternatives and Fisheries Diversification Plan commissioned by the Fisheries Department in collaboration with the Nature Conservancy.

Vision of the Fisheries Sector of Belize

By 2023, fishing communities have a high standard of living with diversified income sources based on multiple economic activities including the sustainable harvesting of a healthy fishery with effective collaboration among all stakeholders. (Source: Shal, V., O. Salas, N. Requena, 2012)

More information on the Fisheries Department can be accessed from: www.fisheries.gov.bz/.

#### Coastal Zone Management Authority and Institute (CZMAI)

The CZMAI was established as a statutory body within the public service through the 1999 Coastal Zone Management Act and is envisioned as the Agency to carry out relevant research and monitoring of coastal ecosystems, in order to inform effective coastal zone management of the Authority. The CZMAI has the mandate to manage the coastal zone of the country by drawing from technical expertise and findings from the Institute as well as from an advisory board comprising of various private and public-sector stakeholder agencies (CZMAI, 2004).

#### Key Supporting Departments and Agencies for the Coastal Zone and Marine Sector

Other key supporting departments and agencies include the:

• Ministry of Economic Development, Petroleum, Investment, Trade & Commerce;

- Belize Customs and Excise Department;
- Belize Trade and Investment Development Service (BELTRAIDE);
- Protective Area Conservation Trust;
- National Meteorological Service (Meteorology Department);
- Forest Department;
- Department of the Environment;
- Belize Coast Guard;
- Pan American Development Foundation;
- Fishing and Marine Products Co-operatives; and
- Several UN Agencies and NGOs.

The existing co-operatives in the Fishing and Marine sub-sector are: National Fishermen, Northern Fishermen, Placencia Producers, and the Rio Grande Fishermen Co-operative.

Further information on these supporting agencies for the Marine and Coastal Zone sector can be reviewed in Annex X of this report.

# **3.2.2 Identification of barriers for Belize's Coastal Zone monitoring network and Early Warning System**

Barriers to consider in the technology transfer of equipment for marine environmental monitoring net work

Barriers were identified in key components for this technology in the Coastal and Marine Ecosystem Sector:

#### • Financial Barriers

High upfront costs for marine environmental monitoring equipment and spares is a barrier that may easily discourage potential investors.

#### **Organizational/regulatory Barriers**

- Many organizations operate in the Coastal Zone but some work in isolation. Coordination and synergy among some key stakeholders is lacking. Fisheries regulations are in place and are arduously being implemented, but there are those stakeholders that have maintain that measures are too restrictive and affect their livelihood.
- Weak Enabling policy environments for establishment of adequate Marine Environmental Monitoring Network.

Currently, marine environmental monitoring is being done for water quality and other physical impacts along coastline and the barrier reef. However, the data collection covers only small sections of the marine environment and historical data is fragmented or periodic, and key indicators/parameters are missing. The Coastal Zone Development and Management Plan makes provision for comprehensive marine environmental monitoring, but capacity, professional human resources and financing are major barriers for an improved and extended marine environmental monitoring network.

#### • Incumbent Technology

Investments in marine environmental monitoring platforms and network have been carried out in the past through many projects and scientific research programme. However, sustainability has proven to be a major problem as funding dry-up and plans to maintain the monitoring network fall apart for lack of finance, decreased I institutional capacity and phasing out of old technology by new, improved and faster systems. This can be a major hurdle in the establishment of a modern, high technology marine monitoring network for the long haul, and workable measures must be implemented for sustainability and safeguarding the capital investment.

#### • Information Barriers

Information on the most reliable, high precision, durable and affordable marine monitoring platforms or sensors is available. In formation on environmental monitoring systems is not a barrier per se; however, the use and its interpretation can be a barrier by the inexperience technicians, clients or environmental officers.

#### • Technical Barriers

Operation and maintenance of an efficient marine environmental monitoring network requires technically skilled technicians. Most of these skill persons are in the Private sector, but many are available in the Public sector. Capacity in the Fisheries and CZMAI is limited, but personnel can be trained to operate the marine monitoring network.

Figure 15 is a problem tree analysis on the "Increasing threats to coastal zone resources and use". The problem tree analysis was conducted with the marine STWG, during which participants identified some of the key barriers to the transfer of marine monitoring platform technology, to provide timely, scientific information to help address the threats to marine ecosystems and the sustainable use of resources. The legal framework for coastal zone management and resource use exist, but the implementation of the same is weak in many instances. Political will is becoming more evident, but sufficient budget for conservation programme and monitoring compliance with the law/regulations is often insufficient. Environmental monitoring by the Fisheries Department is currently none existent, while the database for historic marine elements is disjointed and of short duration (J. Azueta, Project Coordinator, personal comm. October, 2016). The lack of funding for R&D and also for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) constraint the environmental delivery of technical/professional services to stakeholders.



Figure 15: Problem tree for increasing threat to coastal and marine resources and use

#### 3.2.2.1 Economic and financial barriers

Stakeholders indicated that the main economic and financial barriers that may hamper the transferal of technology for the establishment of a marine environmnetal monitoring network and Early Warning system is capital funds of equipment purchase, deployment and spares, as can be obsered in the problem tree analysis and in the summary of critical barriers in Table 35. Annual bugetary allocation for effective regulatory duties by the Fisheries Department covers the basic costs of enforcement, but finance for R&D is available only through projects and in-kind contributions from partners (CZMAI, 2014). Local finance for R&D is often unavailable for institutional scientific research. The Government of Belize in kind contribution will assist to meet maintenance costs once the equipment is deployed and the monitoring network is functioning. Another economic barrier is the inability of local institutions to access financial assistant from international donors because of the complicated requirements involved, and the lack of local experts who can prepare good proposals that can attract funding.

Preliminary Economic Evaluation for Establishment of a Coastal Zone Environmental Monitoring Network and Early Warning System **Features:** The State of the Belize Coastal Zone 2003-2013 Report (CZMAI, 2014) made a number of recommendations with respect to the effects of climate change on coastal and marine ecosystems. These included the strengthening of the environmental and marine network; conduct quantitative vulnerability studies of the coastal zone using historic and current data; use results from studies and near real-time observations to develop early warning for climate and anthropogenic impacts on marine ecosystems; and draft policy recommendations to reduce the projected impacts of climate change.

Under the TNA-Belize project, the Fisheries Department is proposing and plans to coordinate the climate change adaptation technology for the Coastal and Marine sector, namely: *Improved Marine Monitoring Network and Early Warning System for Belize's Coastal Zone to Increase Resilience to Climate Change*.

Preliminary estimates for the capital investment and operational cost are shown below. Capital Investment: Total capital cost: US \$177,965.33 for installation of eight only Marine Environmental Monitoring stations @ US \$22,245.67 per station.

Operating cost: The cost to provide project management, monitoring and evaluation of this technology plus spares is estimated at US \$84,491.34 for five years of the project cycle. (Field operation cost @ US \$8,000.00 per year plus replacement of sensors for two stations over the five-year project cycle).

### 3.2.2.2 Non-financial barriers

The main none-financial barriers to the successful establishment of the marine environmental monitoring network as envisage by the Fisheries Department include:

- Elevated risks to the project resulting from extreme climatic events in the western Caribbean.
- Vandalism resulting in loss of expensive equipment.
- Change in political administration resulting in a change of priority and strategy.
- Change in management, personnel and governance that may impact the Fisheries sector.
- Weak advocacy that does not inform better policies/regulations for integrated and sustainable management of marine resources and build stronger partnership among stakeholders.
- Distrust/lack of communication among stakeholders and coastal communities on critical issues.
- Weak implementation of regulations and adherence to conservation protocols
- Failure to follow the Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan.

• Lack of synergy among partners on critical issues like pollution, effluence discharge, offshore oil exploration, no-take-zones, mangrove forest degradation, dredging in sensitive areas, coral reef bleaching, fish stock depletion, etc.

#### **3.2.3 Identified measures**

Figure 16 is the objective or solution tree analysis of measures to reduce the barriers to the transferal of technology for establishing a modern, marine environmental network of monitoring stations to provide daily needed information for a timely and reliable coastal zone Early Warning System. The general objective is: "Early Warning contributes to decrease threats to Coastal Zone resources and use". One strategic pathway to achieve this objective is to integrate the 'boxes' shaded in green in the 'means' and 'end' portion of the Problem tree diagram.



Figure 16: Solution tree for, 'Early Warning contributes to decreased threat to coastal and marine resources and use'

The proposed strategic pathway is illustrated in Figure 17. Central to the means or measures are: a) Enhance the institutional capacity of the relevant Government agencies and their partner. This is a difficult task, but with the political will and strategic management plan, short and medium-term funding can be identified at the local and international levels. This will facilitate an increase in professional staffing and experts to conduct research and development, and provide scientifically sound data to inform policies and provide an

effective and timely Early Warning for coastal and marine stakeholders and policymakers. The other measures and results all support the objective.

| Objective           | Measures                | Results                                   | Timeframe           |
|---------------------|-------------------------|---|---------------------|
|                     | Upgrade institutional   | - Improved the                            | medium to long term |
|                     | capacity and            | enforcement of                            |                     |
|                     | effectiveness of key    | regulations and                           |                     |
| Decreased threat to | agencies (Fisheries     | provided professional                     |                     |
| Decreasea inreal lo | Dep, CZMAI, etc.)       | services to stakeholders                  |                     |
| Coastal and         | Increase the number of  | - Effective policies and                  | medium term         |
| Marine resources    | specialized             | highly informed sector                    |                     |
| and unsustainable   | experts/trained         | <ul> <li>Improved services and</li> </ul> |                     |
| use through         | personnel in fisheries  | research                                  |                     |
| improved marine     | Upgrade the             | - Effective                               | Short/Medium term   |
| environmental       | implementation of       | implementation and                        |                     |
| monitoring and      | legislative framework   | enforcement of                            |                     |
| Early Warning       | / regulations           | regulations                               |                     |
| Early warning       | Foster at all levels,   | Sustainable practices                     | Short/Medium term   |
| System              | high priority for       | & use of marine                           |                     |
|                     | marine ecosystem        | resources among                           |                     |
|                     | conservation (Public &  | fishers and other                         |                     |
|                     | private stakeholders)   | stakeholders.                             |                     |
|                     |                         | Acceptable KAP                            |                     |
|                     |                         | among coastal zone &                      |                     |
|                     |                         | marine stakeholders                       |                     |
|                     | Increase advocacy       | Healthy fish stock &                      | Short/Medium term   |
|                     | among                   | other marine resources                    |                     |
|                     | partners/stakeholders   |   |                     |
|                     | for the ICZMP           |   |                     |
|                     | implementation          |   |                     |
|                     | Establish an            | Excellent delivery of                     | Medium/Long term    |
|                     | operational and         | services (including data                  |                     |
|                     | effective marine Early  | access and an effective                   |                     |
|                     | Warning system and      | Marine Early Warning)                     |                     |
|                     | delivery                | to stakeholders                           |                     |
|                     | Procure and deploy an   | Reliable and timely data                  | Medium/long term    |
|                     | effective & redundant   | to enhance marine data                    |                     |
|                     | monitoring marine       | base                                      |                     |
|                     | environmental           |   |                     |
|                     | network                 |   |                     |
|                     | Train key personnel to  | Reduced illegal catch                     | Short term          |
|                     | develop skills to write | and resource depletion                    |                     |
|                     | bankable project        |   |                     |

# Table 37: Proposed strategic pathway for objective: 'Early Warning Contributes to decreased threat to Coastal Zone Resources and Use'

| pro  | posals and          |                      |                   |
|------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| ma   | nagement projects   |                      |                   |
| Ide  | ntify and access    | Secured finance and  | Short/medium term |
| Inte | ernational funding  | investment           |                   |
| opr  | oortunities         |                      |                   |
| Imj  | plement measures    | Sustainability of    | Medium/.long term |
| to k | keep operational    | marine environmental |                   |
| and  | l maintenance costs | monitoring           |                   |
| at a | n affordable level  | programme            |                   |

\*KAP: Knowledge, Attitude and Perception

## 3.2.3.1 Economic and financial measures

Capital investment for procuring sensors and marine environmental platforms (stations) are available and can be accessed following the proper protocols and meet strict requirements from international donors such as the Green Fund, GEF, the Climate funds and others. Timely and critical local lobbying can often result in the Government of Belize and local partners contributing in-kind assistant to compliment capital financial assistance from international sources.

### 3.2.3.2 Non-financial measures

Some non-financial measures identified by stakeholders, that may facilitate the smooth transferral of technology for the establishment of a high-techniology, marine environmental monitoring network of observation stations or platforms include:

- Stimulate interest for the marine environment monitoring network and Early Warning System among officials (policymakers) and technical personnel of the Fisheries Department and CZMAI.
- Improve facilities and upgrade technical expertise in the Fisheries Department and among partners (i.e. NGOs, CZMAI, and others) to establish and deploy wireless, monitoring stations at strategic locations across the Belize coastal zone.
- Continue the implementation of Guidelines for effective management of Coastal and Marine resources/reserves as directed in the revise Integrate Coastal Zone Management Plan (CZMAI, 2014).
- Strengthen cooperation and interest among coastal and marine stakeholders and the authorities.

Table 37 summarizes the economic and non-economic barriers and corresponding measures for the transfer and diffusion of the proposed marine monitoring network and early warning system.
| Categories                   | Identified Barriers   | Measures to overcome   | Intervention |              | Funding Sources |              |
|------------------------------|---|--|--------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
|                              |   |  | Legal        | Other        | National        | External     |
|                              | <ul> <li>High up-front cost of<br/>monitoring<br/>equipment/platforms</li> </ul>                      | – Expand access to finance   | C            | $\checkmark$ |                 | $\checkmark$ |
|                              | <ul> <li>High import tax and<br/>limited subsidies for<br/>technology<br/>components</li> </ul>       | <ul> <li>Lobby for reduced import<br/>tax on equipment. Some<br/>tax/duties may not be<br/>applicable for public<br/>goods.</li> </ul> | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$    |              |
| Economic<br>and<br>financial | <ul> <li>High cost of<br/>installation</li> <li>High operational<br/>and maintenance</li> </ul>       | <ul> <li>Provide technology<br/>companies &amp; suppliers<br/>with concession to service<br/>specific areas or groups of</li> </ul>    |              |              |                 |              |
|                              | cost<br>- Elevated financial<br>risks to programme  | clients at reduced service<br>costs (Public-private<br>partnership)  |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$    | $\checkmark$ |
|                              | due to vandalism and<br>praedial larceny<br>- Rising fuel prices                                      | -  |              |              |                 |              |
|                              | -   |  |              |              |                 |              |
| Markat                       | <ul> <li>Low stocks of<br/>spares &amp; components</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Improve access to<br/>products and services.</li> </ul>   |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$    |              |
| conditions                   | <ul> <li>Special interest<br/>groups control market<br/>share and incumbent<br/>technology</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Implement policies &amp;<br/>regulations for favourable<br/>market climate</li> </ul>   | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$    |              |
|                              | <ul> <li>Inadequate policy<br/>and regulatory<br/>framework</li> </ul>                                | <ul> <li>Improve policy and<br/>enabling environment</li> </ul>  |              |              | $\checkmark$    |              |
| Legal and regulatory         | <ul> <li>No office for testing<br/>and certification</li> </ul>                                       | <ul> <li>Establish regulatory<br/>agency for standards,<br/>testing and certification<br/>(equipment,</li> </ul>                       | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$    | $\checkmark$ |
|                              | <ul> <li>Import of cheaper,<br/>inferior-quality<br/>equipment/products</li> </ul>                    | componenets, etc.)<br>– Strengthen regulatory<br>framework (e.g.<br>implementation &<br>penalty)                                       | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$    |              |
| Network<br>structures        | <ul> <li>Networking among<br/>professionals and<br/>agencies weak and</li> </ul>                      | - Enhance networking<br>among key actors and<br>fisherfolks  |              |              | $\checkmark$    | $\checkmark$ |

# Table 38: Market and non-market barriers and corresponding measures related to the transfer of the marine monitoring network and Early Warning

|        | <ul> <li>Ineffective</li> <li>Limited         <ul> <li>environmental             monitoring and             enforcement in the             face of increasing             threat to marine             and coastal zone             resources and use.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Strengthen research,<br/>development and<br/>demonstration of new<br/>technology</li> <li>Increase advocacy<br/>among partners /<br/>stakeholders for the<br/>ICZMP implementation</li> </ul>   | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$ |              |
|--------|---|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|        | - Incoherent<br>environmental<br>monitoring and<br>evaluation plan &<br>early warning<br>system.  | <ul> <li>Establish an operational<br/>and effective marine<br/>Early Warning system<br/>and delivery protocol</li> </ul>   |              | $\checkmark$ | V            | $\checkmark$ |
|        | <ul> <li>Limited awareness<br/>and knowledge of<br/>new technology</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Establish education /<br/>public awareness<br/>campaign among key<br/>stakeholders</li> </ul>   |              | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$ |
| Others | – Low technical capacity  | <ul> <li>Upgrade institutional<br/>capacity and effectiveness<br/>of key agencies (Fisheries<br/>Dep, CZMAI, etc.)</li> <li>Include training<br/>component in<br/>technology diffusion<br/>programme;</li> <li>Increase the number of<br/>specialized<br/>experts/trained personnel</li> </ul> |              | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$ |
|        | <ul> <li>Low KAP among<br/>fishers and other key<br/>stakeholders<br/>operating in the<br/>coastal zone</li> </ul>  | experts/trained personnel<br>in fisheries & CZMAI<br>– Through technology<br>diffusion programme<br>address social, cultural,<br>educational and<br>behavioural issues;<br>improve KAP* among<br>actors on the effects of<br>climate change and  |              | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$ |

| - Institutional<br>capacity of<br>regulating agencies<br>need strengthening  | technology transfer<br>components (Marine<br>environmental<br>monitoring and Early<br>Warning system)<br>- Recruit and increase<br>training locally and<br>abroad<br>- Build capacity among<br>key stakeholders and<br>partners to partition the<br>workload |   | V |                  |
|--|--|---|---|------------------|
| - Restrictive/weak<br>coordination among<br>regulating agencies /<br>departments/ministri<br>es/ NOGs /<br>communities in the<br>coastal zone. | <ul> <li>Increase advocacy and<br/>strengthen coordination<br/>among partners</li> </ul>   |   | N |                  |
| - Ineffective<br>policies to monitor<br>impacts on the<br>coastal zone of<br>current agricultural<br>and tourist-centric<br>development        | - Recommend policy<br>statements/alternatives<br>for improving<br>monitoring programme<br>for marine ecosystems.   | V |   | <br>$\checkmark$ |

## 3.3 Linkages of the barriers identified

Table 38 is a color-coded illustration that attempts to follow the linkage between the economic and non-economic barriers that can suppress the easy transfer of technology for establishing an effective marine environmental monitoring network that will help to inform research, decision makers and an Early Warning bulletin for all stakeholders operating in the Coastal Zone of the country.

 Table 39: Linkages of economic and non-economic barriers identified for the proposed marine environmental monitoring network and early warning system

| Focal<br>Problem  | Identified Barriers   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
|   | Economic/Financial  | Non-financial  |  |  |  |
| Increased threats to<br>Coastal Zone Resources<br>and Use | <ul> <li>High cost of marine<br/>environmental monitoring<br/>stations/equipment</li> <li>Limited finance for deployment,<br/>spares, and high costs for<br/>maintenance</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Absence of an effective<br/>marine monitoring network<br/>and Early Warning System</li> <li>Inaccessibility to spares</li> <li>Weak advocacy that does<br/>not inform better<br/>policies/regulations for<br/>integrated and sustainable<br/>management of marine<br/>resources</li> <li>Distrust/lack of<br/>communication among<br/>stakeholders and coastal<br/>communities on critical<br/>issues.</li> </ul> |  |  |  |
|   | • Inability of local institutions to<br>access financial assistant from<br>international donors because of<br>the complicated requirements<br>involved                              | <ul> <li>Few monitoring /<br/>conservation and R&amp;D<br/>projects being implemented<br/>in the coastal zone</li> </ul>   |  |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Lack of local experts who can<br/>prepare bankable project<br/>proposals that can attract funding</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Failure to follow the<br/>Integrated Coastal Zone<br/>Management Plan</li> <li>Weak implementation of<br/>regulations and adherence to<br/>conservation protocols</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>High import duties and taxes; all<br/>taxes may not apply to public<br/>goods</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>High risks to the project<br/>resulting from extreme<br/>climatic events</li> <li>Vandalism resulting in loss<br/>of expensive equipment</li> <li>Change in political<br/>administration resulting in a<br/>change of priority and<br/>strategy</li> <li>Change in management,<br/>personnel and governance<br/>that may impact the</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |

|   |                                   |   | Fisheries sector.           |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| • | Marine environmental              | • | Limited monitoring of the   |
|   | monitoring network and Early      |   | marine environment and      |
|   | Warning technology is a Public    |   | oceanographic changes       |
|   | Good and will not enjoy 'direct'  |   |                             |
|   | returns on investment             |   |                             |
| • | Ability to source finance locally | • | Weak coordination and       |
|   | is legally problematic; hence     |   | advocacy among partners     |
|   | only GOB can provide such         |   |                             |
|   | allocation                        |   |                             |
| • | Elevated risks to investment      | • | Missed opportunities for    |
|   | arising from extreme events       |   | sustainable development     |
|   | impacting the Coastal Zone        |   | project (GEF, Climate Fund, |
|   |                                   |   | etc.)                       |

Table 39 is another approach to illustrate the linkages to the barriers that may impede the smooth technology transfer to establish a marine environmental monitoring network. It basically highlights the linkages of the barriers with respect to components of the prioritized technology.

## Table 40: Linkages of identified barriers with components of proposed marine environmental monitoring network and early warning system

| E<br>T | Barriers/Technology<br>Transfer  | Early Warning<br>Contributes to<br>decreased threat to<br>Coastal and Marine | Establishment of a<br>modern marine<br>environmental<br>monitoring Network | Institutional<br>strengthening<br>improved and<br>sustained |
|--------|--|--|--|---|
|        |  | Resources and<br>Sustainable Use   |  |   |
| i.     | Incoherent<br>environmental<br>monitoring and<br>evaluation plan and<br>early warning system                                 | 1  | √  | √   |
| ii.    | None existence of<br>national policies to<br>monitor current<br>agricultural and<br>tourist-centric<br>development practices | √  | $\checkmark$   |   |
| iii.   | Gaps/short-coming to<br>follow a coastal zone<br>management plan   |  | 1  | 1   |
| iv.    | Limited long-term<br>research in the marine<br>ecosystem and coastal<br>communities  | 1  |  | 1   |
| v.     | Lack of historic and<br>current oceanographic<br>/marine resources<br>database   |  | 1  | 1   |

| vi. Inadequate                |              |              |              |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| infrastructure & lack         | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |              |
| of a marine                   |              |              |              |
| monitoring network            |              |              |              |
| vii. Constraint of high-      | $\checkmark$ |              | ,            |
| capacity human                |              |              | $\checkmark$ |
| resources                     |              |              |              |
| viii. Lack of synergy and     |              |              |              |
| coordinated work              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |              |
| programme with other          |              |              |              |
| key partners                  |              |              |              |
| ix. Limited, scientifically   |              |              |              |
| informed policies             | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| x. High initial costs         |              |              |              |
| C                             | $\checkmark$ |              |              |
| xi. Weak political will and   |              |              |              |
| limited subsidies and         |              | 1            | $\checkmark$ |
| incentives                    |              | •            | •            |
| xii. Lack of adequate         |              |              |              |
| finance for effective         | 1            | 1            | $\checkmark$ |
| regulatory and                | •            | •            | •            |
| enforcement mandate           |              |              |              |
| and R&D                       |              |              |              |
| xiji Illegal fishing and      |              |              |              |
| unsustainable                 | al           |              | 1            |
| resource                      | •            |              | Y            |
| extraction/use                |              |              |              |
| common                        |              |              |              |
| xiv The impacts of            |              |              |              |
| climate change                |              | 1            |              |
| coupled with                  |              | •            |              |
| anthronogenic                 |              |              |              |
| stressors not fully           |              |              |              |
| understood by                 |              |              |              |
| majority of                   |              |              |              |
| stakeholders                  |              |              |              |
| wy Weak coordination          |              |              |              |
| and cooperation with          |              | 2            | 1            |
| developers and key            |              | •            | Y            |
| stakeholders in               |              |              |              |
| implementation and            |              |              |              |
| compliance of                 |              |              |              |
| fisherias regulations         |              |              |              |
| wi Failura to astablish and   |              |              |              |
| xvi. Failule to establish and | al           | al           | al           |
| maintain credibinty           | V            | N            | V            |
|                               |              |              |              |
| xvii. Implementing same       | .1           |              | .1           |
| ou strategies and             | N N          |              | N            |
| expecting different           |              |              |              |
| results                       |              |              |              |

# **3.4 Enabling framework for overcoming the barriers in the Coastal and Marine Ecosystem Sector**

The strategic measures selected from the earlier enabling framework list and the synthesis from the Objective Tree (Table 36 and Table 37) are listed below. Adopting the measures (actions) can help to facilitate the smooth transferal of technology for the establishment of a modern, marine environmental monitoring network to provide timely and crucial data for the proposed Marine Early Warning System, and inform policy makers and other stakeholders of changes, alterations and impacts observed/measured in the coastal zone, and marine habitats. Some pesent and future actions contributing the an enabling environment in the coastal and Marine sectors are:

- Upgarding the institutional capacity of the Fisheries Department.
- Recommend legislative framework to address reality on the ground.
- Support national and regional scientific research, and access to research results.
- Advocate for high priority given to marine ecosystem conservation by GOB & partners
- Maintain support for recently adopted National Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan for Belize: Creating a Blueprint for Sustainable Coastal Resources Use" (CZMAI, 2016), provides a framework and guidance for sustainable use and protection of marine resources.
- Procure/hire or train personnel with skills to write bankable project proposals.
- Strengthen co-management programme with NGOs/University of Belize at established sites/marine reserves, such as: Calabash Caye, South Water Caye, Hol Chan Marine Reserve, Half Moon Caye, Gladdens Spit, Bacalar Chico, Swallow Caye Marine Reserves to name a few.
- Request tax exemption for importation of Government-commissioned, scientific, marine monitoring and communication equipment.
- Identify international funding opportunities for capital finance for technology transfer.
- Maintain close working relationship with the Tourism Sector and other related productive sub sectors in the Coastal Zone.
- Promulgate the Belize's Barrier Reef (the largest proportion of the Meso-American Barrier Reef System and a sensitive and critical habitat for numerous marine species) as rallying cry for increased support and coordination among local and international partners
- Fisheries Department and CZMAI are strengthened to continue to carry out their mandate to help regulate sustainable development in the Coastal Zone.
- Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and No-Take-Zone are closely managed and utilized.
- Belize Coast Guard has a foreward base near Belize City, and operational centres in several localities in the coastal zone, and provide assistance to safeguard life and property.

Table 40 is a matrix of the Enabling Framework for the diffusion of the prioritized technology: "Marine Environmental Monitoring Network and Early Warning System". Measures and results are listed, along with preliminary timeframe, estimated cost, and responsible entity.

| Barriers           | Measures               | Results               | Timeframe &   | Responsible |
|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-------------|
|                    |                        |                       | Costs         | Entity      |
| Political/Legal    |                        |                       |               |             |
| -Political will    | - Keep policymakers    | - Political will &    | Short/medium  | FD, CZMAI,  |
| lukewarm;          | informed               | environmental         | term          | NGOs        |
| -Laws &            | - strengthen           | advocacy              |               |             |
| Environmental      | legislation to address | heightened;           | Estimated     |             |
| advocacy not       | reality                | - High priority to    | Initial Cost: |             |
| fully              | - empower              | marine ecosystem      | US \$         |             |
| implemented;       | stakeholders           | conservation          | 177,965.33    |             |
| - Change in        | - Improve synergy and  | - Institutional       |               |             |
| political          | coordination with      | capacity enhanced     | Operational   |             |
| administration     | key partners           | and maintained        | cost:         |             |
| resulting in       | - Advocate for         | - Improved services   | US \$         |             |
| change of          | continuity &           |                       | 84,491.34     |             |
| priority/strategy; | mobility in Fisheries  |                       |               |             |
| -Political         | Sector                 |                       |               |             |
| appointment        | - Minimized political  |                       |               |             |
|                    | appointment, ensure    |                       |               |             |
|                    | hiring of qualified    |                       |               |             |
|                    | technicians            |                       |               |             |
| Economic and       | - Funds procured for   | - Data base of marine | Short/medium  | FD, CZMAI,  |
| Financial          | marine monitoring      | information and       | term          | NGOs        |
| -High cost of      | network and            | environmental         |               |             |
| procuring and      | accessories            | monitoring            |               |             |
| deploying          | - Revolving funds      | parameters            |               |             |
| marine             | available for spares,  |                       |               |             |
| monitoring         | deployment, and        | - An effective        |               |             |
| stations;          | maintenance            | Coastal and Marine    |               |             |
| High cost for      | - Benefits of Marine   | Early Warning         |               |             |
| spares,            | Early Warning          | system                |               |             |
| equipment &        | assessed/measured      |                       |               |             |
| maintenance;       | through indicators     | - Technical and       |               |             |
| -lack of tangible  | and economic           | scientific            |               |             |
| economic           | performance            | information and data  |               |             |
| benefits of        | - Funds for on-going   | to inform policy      |               |             |
| marine early       | training,              |                       |               |             |
| warning;           | institutional          |                       |               |             |
| - Elevated         | strengthening and      |                       |               |             |
| training costs     | advocacy available     |                       |               |             |

 Table 41: Enabling framework for proposed marine early warning system

| and security of                  |                      |                        |              |            |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------|------------|
| equipment                        |                      |                        |              |            |
|                                  |                      |                        |              |            |
|                                  |                      |                        |              |            |
| Non-financial                    |                      |                        | Short/Medium | FD, CZMAI, |
|                                  | - Establishment of a | - Technical and        | term         | NGOs       |
| -Fragmented                      | robust and           | scientific             |              |            |
| and weak water                   | dependable Marine    | information and data   |              |            |
| auality/marine                   | environmental        | to inform policy:      |              |            |
| quanty/marine                    | monitoring network   | -                      |              |            |
| monitoring                       | in the coastal zone  | - Reliable data for    |              |            |
| monitoring                       | of Belize:           | future research        |              |            |
| programme/                       | - Establish an       | - Realizable data to   |              |            |
| protocol;                        | improved Marine      | help evaluate          |              |            |
|                                  | database in the      | changes in marine      |              |            |
|                                  | Fisheries            | resources              |              |            |
|                                  | Department           | resources              |              |            |
| Culture /                        | Department.          |                        | Short/Medium | FD C7MAI   |
| Tradition                        | - Expanded public    | - Increased            | term         | NGOs       |
| -Negative                        | awareness and        | sensitivity to protect | term         | 11005      |
| attituda &                       | education            | and conserve marine    |              |            |
| nercention of                    | programme            | resources              |              |            |
| marine                           | programme            | - Less incidents of    |              |            |
| acosystam                        | - Increased advocacy | - Less merdents of     |              |            |
| conservation:                    | among coastal and    | especially in No.      |              |            |
| Conservation,<br>General lack of | marina stakeholders  | Take Zones and         |              |            |
| -Oeneral lack of                 | marme stakenoiders   | Protocted areas        |              |            |
| corruption and                   |                      | Less report of out     |              |            |
| - corruption and                 |                      | - Less report of out-  |              |            |
| KICKDUCKS                        |                      | Stakaholdars rasport   |              |            |
|                                  |                      | - Stakeholders respect |              |            |
|                                  |                      | laws and               |              |            |
|                                  |                      | ragulations            |              |            |
| Sustainability                   | Ducasura and danlars | Timely and reliable    | Shout/Madine |            |
| Sustainability                   | - Procure and deploy | - Timery and remable   | Short/Wealum | FD, CZMAI, |
| -Lack of reliable                | runy equipped        | marine                 | term         | NGUS       |
| information and                  | network of marine    | Warning System         |              |            |
| data to inform                   |                      | Warning System         |              |            |
| long-term                        |                      | - Revolving fund for   |              |            |
| decision;                        | - Quanned personnel  | spares, maintenance    |              |            |
| - Weak                           | aiways available     | and replacement        |              |            |
| institutional                    | - rund available for | - Keuuceu stall        |              |            |
| /technical                       | spares and           | turnover, fully        |              |            |
| capacity                         | maintenance          | quannea personnel      |              |            |
| - Negative                       |                      | maintained             |              |            |
| impacts of                       |                      | - Safety and insurance |              |            |
| extreme climatic                 |                      | tor                    |              |            |
| events                           |                      | equipment/sensors      |              |            |

### **CHAPTER 4.** Water sector

### 4.1 Preliminary targets for technology transfer and diffusion

The preliminary target for the WSP technology transfer is summarized in Table xxx. On the question that the intervention is too ambitious: the answer is 'no'. The benefits of ensuring that rural communities of over 200 families have a reliable and secured supply of potable water, far outweighs the costs. The aim of establishing an integrated management strategy for water safety and potable water system to rural communities is to ensure an efficient water delivery service that meets all the health safety and engineering standards to improve the livelihood security of clients. For those unable pay the minimal fee for the service, GOB will provide a mechanism to defray the cost, so that the RWS remains viable.

| Sector:            | Targets               | Too Ambitious?        | Conservative          |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Technologies       |                       |                       |                       |
| Water              |                       |                       |                       |
| 1. Integrated      | -Establishing Water   | No. The benefits      | Yes. Properly         |
| Management         | Safety Management     | including: Human      | implemented water     |
| Strategy for Water | Plan for threatened   | health and safety;    | safety plans ensure   |
| Safety for Rural   | RWS in eight rural    | reduced costs to the  | good water quality,   |
| Water Supply       | communities of        | national health       | and efficient and     |
| Systems            | approximately 200     | service; more time    | reliable distribution |
|                    | families per village. | for productive        | to clients. It will   |
|                    | The technology        | activities, improved  | safeguard the         |
|                    | transfer will ensure  | nutritional intakes   | resource and          |
|                    | secured potable       | and decreased food    | contribute towards    |
|                    | water and             | insecurity, etc., far | the country's         |
|                    | sustainable use of    | out weigh the costs.  | commitment to the     |
|                    | water resources.      | The intervention      | SDGs.                 |
|                    |                       | will engender         | The preliminary       |
|                    |                       | increased             | cost for this         |
|                    |                       | cooperation among     | technology transfer   |
|                    |                       | key actors in RWS     | is estimated as:      |
|                    |                       | operations and        | US\$ 342,000.00.      |
|                    |                       | village water         | Three-year            |
|                    |                       | boards.               | operational cost is   |
|                    |                       | The management        | US\$ 71,000.00        |
|                    |                       | strategy for water    |                       |
|                    |                       | safety for RWS can    |                       |
|                    |                       | be replicated in      |                       |

 Table 42: Summary of the WSP technology targets for the water sector and benefits versus costs

| other communities  |
|--------------------|
| experiencing       |
| similar problems,  |
| thus strengthening |
| the national       |
| network of RWS     |
| water services.    |

# **4.2** Barrier analysis and possible enabling measures for integrated management strategy for water safety in eight Rural Water Supply Systems

## **4.2.1** General description of for integrated management strategy for water safety in eight Rural Water Supply Systems

The technology intervention through the TNA initiative: *An Integrated Management Strategy for Water Safety in Eight Rural Water Supply Systems in Belize*, will target rural communities in Belize where recurrent health problems have been detected because of poor water quality service. In these communities, Village Water Boards are on record for poor water delivery services, and inadequate management of water service systems is prevalent. Once proven to work in these communities, the Water Safety Plan(s) may be extended to other communities facing similar difficulties with their rudimentary water supply systems, and communities where rudimentary water infrastructure and water boards will be established in the near future (Boden, J, Principal Public Health Officer, pers. Comm. Oct. 2016).

#### Water Safety Plans

The World Health Organization (WHO, 2008) Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality (GDWQ) is the basis for current water quality standards in many countries around the world. In the WHO water quality guidelines, Water Safety Plans (WSPs) are described collectively as a systematic and integrated approach to water supply management based on assessment and control of various factors that pose a threat to the safety of drinking water. WSPs enable identification of threats to water safety during all phases in the supply chain, from the catchment sites to the transport, treatment and distribution of drinking water. This approach is fundamentally different from those traditionally adopted by water suppliers, which rely on treatment and end-product testing to ensure water safety. When implemented successfully, the WSP approach can ensure that water quality is maintained in almost any water service and delivery systems Figure 17 shows a schematic of the framework for safe drinking adapted from Davidson et al. (2005). The main programmes of the safe drinking framework are: System assessment, monitoring, water and management and communication.



Figure 17: Steps in the development of a WSP (Adapted from Davison et al., 2005)

The components of the adaptation technology related to the Water Safety Plan will consist of:

- An initial, then periodic assessment and monitoring of the target communities RWS during the project cycle period. This will entail assessing and maintenance of the RWS infrastructure in coordination with the Village Water Boards; monthly water quality sampling and analysis; water borne illness monitoring;
- 2) Drafting and adoption of a comprehensive Water Safety Plan for Rudimentary Water Supply Systems. An expert in the field of Public health and Water will be hired for three months to coordinate and develop the WSP. Adoption by Cabinet and operationalization by the MOH and partners will take at least eight.
- 3) Following adoption of the WSP, the Public Health Bureau, along with key stakeholders such as Rural Water Unit (Ministry of Labour, Local Government and Human Development), Social Investment Fund (SIF), PAHO, Red Cross, National Association of Village Councils (NAVCO), etc. will operationalize the WSP in the eight target communities for the remaining two years of the technology transfer project cycle. The Government of Belize through the MOH will then take over the financial responsibility to sustain and replicate the WSP in the target communities and others.
- 4) Institutional strengthening will be required for the Public Health Bureau and eight Village Water Boards, training of selected members of Village Water Boards (two per Water Board, six in all for 3 years per Water Board. Total 48), strengthening of the Public Health Water Laboratory, and employment of at least four Rudimentary Water System Technicians, Two Water Quality Analyst, and one National WSP

Coordinator. WSP Coordinator will be nominated from among Public Health personnel.

5) Cost for hiring one Water Consultant for three months to develop and coordinate the public consultation and adoption of the WSP.

### Supporting Department and Agencies in the Water Sector

- Rural Development Department, Ministry of Labour, Local Government and Rural Development (MLLGRD).
- Public Health Bureau in the Ministry of Health.
- Ministry of Finance.
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Agriculture.
- The Belize Social Investment Fund.
- Statistical Institute of Belize.
- The National Hydrological Service, Ministry of Natural Resources

## 4.2.2 Identification of barriers for integrated management strategy for water safety in eight Rural Water Supply Systems

The list of barriers identified by stakeholders in connection with the proposed, integrated management strategy for water safety in eight rural water supply systems were the following:

- Political will to support improved rural water services.
- Animosity and weak water governance at the local level.
- Insufficient funds to improve infrastructure in water distribution system.
- Limited technical and managerial capacity.
- Initial/capital costs for drafting, reviewing and implementing management strategy and technical training programme for RWS will be comparatively high.
- High cost of spares and equipment.
- Fragmented and weak water quality monitoring protocol.
- Public Health water laboratory lacks capacity to do systematic analysis of water samples for all Rudimentary Water Systems in a consistent and timely manner.
- Only two water laboratories operational in the country of Belize. The private water laboratory of Bowen and Bowen Group of Companies is well equipped and do excellent analysis, but the cost can be high.
- Weak coordination among key actors /Departments and agencies associated with RWS.
- Lack of reliable information and data on rural water quality and supply.
- Water authorities and public health reactive and not proactive on water supply and water quality issues.

- Very little study and research done on groundwater capacity, characteristics and sources pollution
- Water Board members appointed, and not totally committed.
- Inadequate training from technical personnel and village Water Board members

Barriers to consider in the technology transfer for the Management and Operation for Water Safety of eight Rural Water Supply Systems in Belize.

The characteristics of barriers identified by key components for this technology transfer in the Water Sector are the following:

#### • Financial Barriers

Financial management in the operation of Rudimentary Water Systems (RWS) is key for a successful water delivery service and its sustainability. Poor financial management of RWS is attributed to weak institutional capacity. The high cost of spares, such as water pumps and chemicals, is also a barrier for the successful operation of RWS.

#### Organizational/regulatory Barriers

Members of Village Water Boards are politically assigned or nominated. Many of the political appointees do not have the capacity or commitment to do the job. The Village Council Act that governs the Village Water Boards must be reviewed, and amendments made to address this issue. Weak coordination among key actors/Departments and agencies associated with RWS

• Weak Enabling policy environments for management and operation of Rural Water systems

The policy regarding Village Water Board needs to be revised so that qualified personnel committed to the work can be hired or contracted.

#### • Incumbent Technology

RWS have worked in many parts of the world including Belize. Investments in this technology for delivery of safe water supply to rural communities will continue. The improved technology has become automated, including the water purification component. Solar PV technology is also being introduced to run the water pumps. However, the problem is governance of these systems, and the main barrier to address this problem is self interest and control.

#### • Market failures

As a water service provider, RWS that are run by Village Water Boards should embrace the service as a business and as such, each should have a business plan, taking into considetation that some villagers or the poor, may have to be subidies, until thay can afford to pay for the service. Otherwise, the RWS may not be sustainable.

#### • Information Barriers

Relevant information on components of RWS is lodged in the offices of the Rural Development Department in the Ministry of Labour, Local Government and Rural

Development, in the Public Health Bureau, and at the Social Investment Fund (SIF). Technical and managerial capacity to run the daily operations of an RWS successfully is the critical barrier identified by stakeholders. Information and audits of RWS are inaccessible or do not exists.

#### • Technical Barriers

Committed and skilled persons are required to operate, manage and maintain RWS in accordance with an adopted Water Safety Plan. The technology transfer for the *Management and Operation for Water Safety of eight Rural Water Supply Systems* will include measures to overcome the technical deficiency associated with the following:

- The need for sustainable and safe water delivery systems for the target communities.
- Efficient and transparent village Rudimentary Water System services.

## Selection and decomposition of critical barriers for diffusion of improved drip irrigation

Table 43 shows the outcome of categorization of barriers as per Financial and None-Financial barriers in accordance to a criteria and their importance for the transfer and diffusion of water safety technology. Barriers scoring a 1 or 2 on a Likert scale (1 to 5) were selected for further analysis.

| No. | Barriers          | Cr           | Criteria and Importance of Barriers for Technology 2 |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |
|-----|-------------------|--------------|--|-----------|-----------|----------------|------|--|--|--|
|     | Economic &        | 1. Critical  | 2.   | 3.        | 4.        | 5.             |      |  |  |  |
|     | Financial         | (killer,     | Crucial  | Important | Less      | Insignificant  | Rank |  |  |  |
|     |                   | non-starter) |  |           | important | (easy starter) |      |  |  |  |
| 1   | - High cost of    | х            |  |           |           |                | 1    |  |  |  |
|     | spares and        |              |  |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |
|     | equipment         |              |  |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |
| 2   | - Lack of funds   |              | Х  |           |           |                | 2    |  |  |  |
|     | to improve        |              |  |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |
|     | infrastructure    |              |  |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |
|     | in water          |              |  |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |
|     | distribution      |              |  |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |
|     | system            |              |  |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |
|     | - Initial/capital | Х            |  |           |           |                | 1    |  |  |  |
|     | costs for         |              |  |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |
|     | drafting,         |              |  |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |
|     | reviewing and     |              |  |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |
|     | implementing      |              |  |           |           |                |      |  |  |  |

| Table 43: Criteria and Importance of Barriers for the diffusion of an Integrated |
|--|
| Management Strategy for threatened Rudimentary Water Systems                     |

|   | management        |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|   | strategy and      |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | technical         |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | training          |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | programme for     |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | RWS will be       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | comparatively     |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | high              |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3 | - Poor financial  |   | Х |   |   |   | 2 |
|   | management of     |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | RWS               |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4 | - Foreign         |   |   |   | Х |   | 4 |
|   | exchange and      |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | corresponding     |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | banking           |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | Non-financial     |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | Organization /    |   |   | X |   |   | 3 |
|   | Regulatory        |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5 | - Water Board     | x |   |   |   |   | 1 |
|   | members lack      |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | managerial skills |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | - Water Board     |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | members           |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | politically       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | appointed and     |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | not totally       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | committed         |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 6 | - Weak            | x |   |   |   |   | 1 |
| 0 | coordination      | ~ |   |   |   |   | 1 |
|   | among key         |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | actors/Dep/       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | agencies          |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | associated with   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | RWS               |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | Enabling policy   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | environments      |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7 | - Policy          |   | Х |   |   |   | 2 |
|   | regarding         |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | Village Water     |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | Board needs to    |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | be revised        |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | Incumbent         |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | RWS               |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | technology        |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8 | - Un-metered      |   | X |   |   |   | 2 |
| 1 | 1                 | 1 |   |   | 1 | 1 |   |

|    |                    | - |   |   |  |   |
|----|--------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
|    | village water      |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | supply systems.    |   |   |   |  |   |
| 9  | - Monopoly and     |   | Х |   |  | 2 |
|    | personal interest  |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | politically        |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | connected          |   |   |   |  |   |
| 10 | - Fragmented       |   |   | X |  | 3 |
|    | & weak water       |   |   |   |  | - |
|    | quality            |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | quality            |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | monitoring         |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | protocol           |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | Information        |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | barrier            |   |   |   |  |   |
| 11 | - Lack of reliable |   |   | Х |  | 3 |
|    | information and    |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | data on rural      |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | water quality      |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | and supply.        |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | Technical          |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | barrier            |   |   |   |  |   |
| 12 | - Limited or weak  | Х |   |   |  | 1 |
|    | technical          |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | capacity in RWS    |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | services           |   |   |   |  |   |
| 13 | - Weak             | Х |   |   |  | 1 |
|    | management         |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | capacity in the    |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | R w S serices      |   |   |   |  |   |
| 14 | Dising fuel        |   | v |   |  | 2 |
| 14 | - Kising Iuei      |   | А |   |  | 2 |
| 15 | - Rising costs of  |   |   | x |  | 3 |
| 15 | transportation     |   |   | А |  | 5 |
| 16 | - Very little R    |   |   | х |  | 3 |
|    | & D done on        |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | groundwater        |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | groundwater        |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | capacity,          |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | characteristics    |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | and sources        |   |   |   |  |   |
|    | pollution          |   |   |   |  |   |

Table 44 is a summary of the decomposition of critical (none-starter) and crucial barriers for the smooth transfer and diffusion of the technology to implement an integrated management strategy for threatened RWS.

| Category of               | 1. Critical (killer,    | 2. Crucial           | Elements of     | Dimension of      |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Barriers                  | non-starter)            |                      | killer or non-  | barrier elements  |
|                           |                         |                      | starters        |                   |
|                           |                         |                      |                 |                   |
| Economic &                | - Initial/capital costs | - Poor financial     | - High interest | - 12 – 15 % on    |
| Financial                 | for drafting,           | management of        | rates           | certain           |
|                           | reviewing and           | RWS                  |                 | components        |
|                           | implementing            | - High import taxes  | - Elevated cost | - Interest rates  |
|                           | management              | and limited          | of specialized  | could be 6 to 12  |
|                           | strategy and            | subsidies            | services        | % per annum       |
|                           | technical training      | - None metered       | -               | , per uniturn     |
|                           | programme for 8         | connections          |                 |                   |
|                           | RWS will be             | resulting in         |                 |                   |
|                           | comparatively high      | revenue loss         |                 |                   |
|                           |                         | - Financial          |                 |                   |
|                           |                         | records not          |                 |                   |
|                           |                         | transparent          |                 |                   |
|                           |                         | - Rising fuel prices |                 |                   |
|                           | - High cost of          |                      | - High import   | - Service cost    |
|                           | spares and              |                      | duties & taxes  | could be as high  |
|                           | equipment (e,g,         |                      | on components   | as 15 % of        |
|                           | electrical energy,      |                      | 1               | capital cost      |
|                           | water pumps, etc.)      |                      |                 | 1                 |
|                           | - High O & M costs      | -                    | - Scarcity of   | - Technical       |
|                           | 6                       |                      | certified       | capacity in key   |
|                           |                         |                      | technical       | Dep./Units etc.   |
|                           |                         |                      | personnel       | low or does not   |
|                           |                         |                      | locally         | exist.            |
|                           |                         |                      | 5               | - Staff/personnel |
|                           |                         |                      |                 | stretch thin      |
| Market failures           | -                       | -                    | -               | -                 |
|                           |                         |                      |                 |                   |
| <b>Policy/Regulations</b> | -                       | - Policy regarding   | - Village       | - Water Board     |
|                           |                         | Village Water        | Council Act     | members (i.e.     |
|                           |                         | Board needs to be    | make provision  | Chairperson)      |
|                           |                         | revised              | for Water       | appointed by      |
|                           |                         |                      | Board           | Minister          |
|                           |                         |                      | membership      |                   |
|                           |                         |                      |                 |                   |

 Table 44: Selection of killer or non-starter barriers to the diffusion of an Integrated

 Management Strategy for threatened Rudimentary Water Systems (RWS)

| Non-financial | -Water Board   | - Public Service  | - Limited  | - Lack of  |
|---------------|--|---|--|--|
|               | <ul> <li>water bound<br/>members lack<br/>managerial skills</li> <li>Water Board<br/>politically<br/>appointed and not<br/>totally committed</li> <li>Poor/limited<br/>institutional<br/>capacity of Village<br/>Water Boards</li> <li>Weak coordination<br/>among key<br/>actors/Dep/<br/>agencies associated<br/>with RWS</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>I uble betwee</li> <li>limited in</li> <li>specialized</li> <li>personnel</li> <li>Imported</li> <li>equipment and</li> <li>reagents not of</li> <li>the best quality</li> <li>Monopoly and</li> <li>personal interest</li> <li>groups politically</li> <li>connected</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>knowledge and<br/>technical &amp;<br/>managerial<br/>capacity among<br/>Water Board<br/>members</li> <li>Bad<br/>experience with<br/>mal-<br/>functioning<br/>system and<br/>chemicals</li> <li>Cannot afford<br/>installation cost</li> <li>Reassess and<br/>develop new<br/>working<br/>strategy among<br/>key actors<br/>related to RWS</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>coordinated<br/>training</li> <li>Water Borad<br/>personnel<br/>engage in other<br/>occupation</li> <li>Inadequate<br/>design and poor<br/>material</li> <li>Extended<br/>subsidies for the<br/>poor, or totally<br/>un-metered RWS<br/>service.</li> <li>Actors/agencies<br/>/ Departments<br/>institutionally<br/>weak</li> </ul> |

Figure 18 is a Problem Tree centered on the focal problem: "Limited Institutional Capacity of Village Water Boards". The main causes and effects highlighted were identified by stakeholders in the Sector-based Technology Working Group (STWG).

Some of the main causes attributed to the problem are:

- limited knowledge and technical skills of water systems;
- Few training programme for technical personnel and Water Board members;
- Inadequate appointment policy for Water Board members;
- Irregular or extended time interval between laboratory water test;
- Limited finance for replacement parts and maintenance;
- Unreliable water supply service;
- Responsibility for operation and maintenance not taken seriously.

Some effects include:

- Limited commitment
- Poorly managed system;
- Inefficient Watter Boards and RWS service
- Inadequate water supply systems;

#### • Poor water quality.



## Figure 18: Problem Tree for limited institutional capacity/management of Rural Water Boards

### 4.2.2.1 Economic and financial barriers

The main economic barriers to the transfer of the technology identified by stakeholders are:

- High cost of spare parts and equipment.
- Limited finance for replacement costs and maintenance.
- Poor financial management of RWS.
- Board members not paid, mostly voluntary service.
- Little investment in basic financial management and improving technical skills.
- Some RWS not metered, hence minimum returns for water services and inadequate budget for operation.
- Water Boards should be "business oriented", have a business approach to their operation, while seeking a balance for the social needs of communities.

Preliminary Economic Evaluation for 'Integrated Management Strategy for Water Safety in Eight Rural Water Supply Systems in Belize'

In rural communities, Village Water Boards manage the Rudimentary Water Systems and piped water to residence. Here, the coverage nationwide is about 95 % and the water source

is mostly groundwater. There are some 150 Village Water Boards and about a third of them have experienced and continue to experience water quality, infrastructural and management problems in the water supply chain. The Public Health Bureau (PHB) in the Ministry of Health (MOH) is the agency primarily responsible for monitoring water quality and water related health issues in Belize. The PHB will be the agency coordinating the rural water system WSP for the target communities under the Integrated Management Strategy for Water Safety in Eight Rural Water Supply Systems in Belize. The targeted Rudimentary Water Systems (RWS) will be distributed as follow: three in the southern Toledo District, three in the Stann Creek District, and two in the Cayo District.

Properly developed and executed WSP can be regarded as an effective climate change adaptation measure to manage, utilize and conserve the country's water resources, especially for vulnerable and marginalized rural communities.

The components of the adaptation technology related to the Water Safety Plan will consist of:

- An initial, then periodic assessment and monitoring of the target communities RWS during the project cycle period. This will entail assessing and maintenance of the RWS infrastructure in coordination with the Village Water Boards; monthly water quality sampling and analysis; water borne illness monitoring;
- 2) Drafting and adoption of a comprehensive Water Safety Plan for Rudimentary Water Supply Systems. An expert in the field of Public health and Water will be hired for three months to coordinate and develop the WSP. Adoption by Cabinet and operationalization by the MOH and partners will take at least eight.
- 3) Following adoption of the WSP, the Public Health Bureau, along with key stakeholders such as Rural Water Unit (Ministry of Labour, Local Government and Human Development), Social Investment Fund (SIF), PAHO, Red Cross, National Association of Village Councils (NAVCO), etc. will operationalize the WSP in the eight target communities for the remaining two years of the technology transfer project cycle. The Government of Belize through the MOH will then take over the financial responsibility to sustain and replicate the WSP in the target communities and others.
- 4) Institutional strengthening will be required for the Public Health Bureau and eight Village Water Boards, training of selected members of Village Water Boards (two per Water Board, six in all for 3 years per Water Board. Total 48), strengthening of the Public Health Water Laboratory, and employment of at least four Rudimentary Water System Technicians, Two Water Quality Analyst, and one National WSP

Coordinator. WSP Coordinator will be nominated from among Public Health personnel.

5) Cost for hiring one Water Consultant for three months to develop and coordinate the public consultation and adoption of the WSP.

**Capital Investment:** US \$ 342,000.00 will cover costs for hiring one Public Health and Water expert for three months, hiring two water quality analysts and four Rudimentary Water System technicians (3 years), purchasing eight spare water pumps, one vehicle for field work, information and database equipment, and training costs.

#### **Operating cost:** US \$71,000.00

(Source: Factsheet for Water Sector Technology: Integrated Management Strategy for Water Safety in Eight Rural Water Supply Systems in Belize, TNA project, Belize)

### 4.2.2.2 Non-financial barriers

- Political appointments;
- Little commitment and interest;
- Poor management tradition of Village Water Boards;
- Fragmented and weak water quality monitoring protocol;
- Lack of reliable information and data on rural water quality and supply;
- Very limited knowledge and data of groundwater;
- Very little study and research done on groundwater capacity, characteristics and sources pollution;
- Water authorities and public health reactive and not proactive on issues related to water supply and water quality.

#### **4.2.3 Identified measures**

A Solution Tree based on the objective: "Improved Institutional Capacity of Village Water Boards", is shown in Figure 19. A preliminary strategic option for this objective are summarised in Table 45 and are based on the 'Measures' and 'Results' boxes shaded in green.



Figure 19: Solution/Objective Tree for improved management of Rural Water Boards

 Table 45: Proposed strategic pathway for objective, 'Improved Institutional Capacity of Village Water Boards'

| Objective  | Measures   | Results  | Timeframe         |
|--|--|--|-------------------|
| Improved<br>Institutional<br>Capacity of Village | Implement training<br>programme to increase<br>knowledge & technical<br>skills of Rural Water<br>Systems | Unlimited<br>commitment;<br>Extensive knowledge<br>of system   | Short/medium term |
| Water Boards                                     | Hire or contract skilled operators   | Improved operation and maintenance   | Short/medium term |
|  | Redress appointment<br>policy for Village<br>Water Board members   | Water system<br>management improved  | Short/Medium term |
|  | Improve financial and<br>operational<br>management of RWS  | Efficient and reliable water supply system   | Medium/long term  |
|  | Budget for<br>replacement parts and<br>maintenance   | Efficient Water Boards   | Medium/long term  |
|  | Revise and implement<br>protocol for an<br>efficient water quality<br>analysis programme                 | Decreased use of<br>untreated water from<br>other sources.<br>Potable water through<br>distribution line | Short/Medium term |
|  | Upgraded infra-<br>structure and<br>equipment  | Improved health and nutrition  | Medium/long term  |

## 4.2.3.1 Economic and financial measures

Some identified economic and financial measures to achieve the objective: *Improved Institutional Capacity of Village Water Boards* include:

- Establish contract service for all Water Boards in the country.
- Establish an effective and non-political appointment process for non-contract members. Will require policy change for Water Board member appointments
- Conduct annual financial estimates of receivables and expenditures (Audit), if it is not being carried. This is critical for transparency and good management. Cost covered by recurrent budget of Village Water Boards.
- Designate a recurrent and feasible budget for O&M in RWS services.
- Install metering to all RWS system.
- Ensure subsidies for poorer clients are provided.
- Village Water Boards in coordination with Rural Water Dep, Public Health and partners, will identified and use capital financing for development of Water Safety Plans and effective training of Trainers and target Water Board members and others.

### 4.2.3.2 Non-financial measures

The following is the list of non-financial measures:

- Lobby for policy change for appointment of Water Board members.
- Establish an open and transparent RWS management system.
- Expand knowledge & technical skills of Rural Water Systems technicians
- Conduct regular training targeting Water Boards members.
- Public Health Bureau develops and implements a timely water quality monitoring protocol for target Rudimentary Water Systems.
- Institute and implement timely actions on the part of Public Health Bureau, Rural Development Department, and Village Water Boards to deal with water safety, related issues connected with target RWS.
- NAVCO helps coordinate 'best practice' programme for RWS services.

Table 46 is a summary of financial and none-financial barriers and corresponding measures to facilitate 'an integrated water safety mananement strategy and plan for threatened RWS'.

| Categories                        | Identified Barriers  | Measures to overcome  | Intervention |              | Funding Sources |              |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
|                                   |  | barriers  | Legal        | Other        | National        | External     |
|                                   | – High initial<br>investment   | <ul> <li>Expand access to finance</li> <li>Utilize capital financing<br/>for development of Water</li> <li>Safety Plans and effective<br/>training of Trainers and<br/>target Water Board</li> <li>members.</li> </ul>                      | Legui        | √            | √               | √            |
| Economic                          | <ul> <li>Limited subsidies</li> <li>for technology</li> <li>components</li> </ul>                    | - Lobby for reduced import<br>taxes on equipment  |              |              | $\checkmark$    |              |
| and financial                     | – High cost of<br>installation and<br>operation of RWS   | <ul> <li>Provide technology</li> <li>companies &amp; suppliers with</li> <li>concession to service</li> <li>specific areas or groups of</li> <li>clients at reduced service</li> <li>costs (Public-private</li> <li>partnership)</li> </ul> |              | V            |                 | $\checkmark$ |
|                                   | - Poor financial<br>management of<br>RWS   | - Improve financial and<br>operational management of<br>RWS   |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$    | $\checkmark$ |
|                                   | - Appointment and voluntary service  | <ul> <li>Establish contract</li> <li>service for all Water</li> <li>Boards in the country</li> </ul>  |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$    |              |
| Market conditions                 | <ul> <li>Local hardware<br/>stores often low in<br/>stocks of spares &amp;</li> </ul>                | <ul> <li>Improve access to<br/>products and services.</li> <li>Grow the market for new</li> </ul>   |              | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$    | $\checkmark$ |
|                                   | – Unstable,<br>monopoly, special<br>interest groups  | <ul> <li>Implement policies &amp;</li> <li>regulations for favourable</li> <li>market climate</li> </ul>  | $\checkmark$ |              | $\checkmark$    |              |
| Legal and regulatory              | – Inadequate policy<br>and regulatory<br>framework   | <ul> <li>Lobby for Policy revision</li> <li>regarding Village Water</li> <li>Board contracts and</li> <li>appointment</li> </ul>  |              |              | $\checkmark$    |              |
| Network<br>structures &<br>others | - Networking<br>among Village<br>Water Boards,<br>professionals in<br>water resources<br>and related | <ul> <li>Enhance networking of<br/>RWS Village Water</li> <li>Boards through NAVCO.</li> <li>Strengthen research and<br/>development in water</li> <li>resource management &amp;</li> </ul>   |              |              |                 | V            |

# Table 46: Summary of barriers and corresponding measures for instituting anIntegrated water safety management strategy and plan for threatened RWS

| agencies we       | ak and services             |               |              |   |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|--------------|---|
| ineffective       |                             |               |              |   |
| - Poor/limite     | d Develop an on-go          | ing           |              |   |
| institutiona      | l training programm         | ne for        |              | 2 |
| capacity of       | Village Water Board mem     | ibers         |              | v |
| Water Boar        | rds                         |               |              |   |
| - Weak coor       | rdination Strenghten coordi | nation        |              |   |
| among key         | and work program            | ime           |              |   |
| actors/Dep/       | among key actors            | , √           | $\checkmark$ |   |
| agencies as       | ssociated departments and a | igencies      |              |   |
| with RWS          | associated with R           | WS            |              |   |
| – Water authority | orities – Update protocol   | to            |              |   |
| and Public H      | Iealth address water safe   | ty issues     |              |   |
| reactive to is    | related to RWS.             |               |              |   |
| related to RV     | WS - Build institutiona     | ıl √          | $\checkmark$ |   |
| services, not     | pro- capacity               |               |              |   |
| active.           | -                           |               |              |   |
| – Low techn       | ical – Establish trainin    | α             |              |   |
| conacity          | component in tech           | 5<br>mology √ |              | 2 |
| capacity          | diffusion program           | inology v     |              | v |
| - Afraid of a     | annusion program            |               |              |   |
|                   | diffusion program           | ogy           |              |   |
|                   |                             | litural and   |              |   |
|                   | habavioural igoua           | $\sqrt{100}$  |              |   |
|                   | improve KAD*                | <i>,</i> ,    |              |   |
|                   | improve KAP* an             | nong          |              |   |
|                   | users                       |               |              |   |

## 4.3 Linkages of the barriers identified

Table 47 illustrates the linkages of identified financial and non-financial barriers in a colorcoded format. An example of this linkage is that of the "Fragmented and weak water quality monitoring protocol" under non-financial barrier, and the "High cost of spares and equipment" and "Limited finance for replacement costs and maintenance". The measures to these barriers then form the strategic pathway for facilitating the technology transfer and improved management of the threatened RWS in Belize. 

 Table 47: Linkages of Barriers identified for Limited Institutional Capacity of Village

 Water Boards

| Focal                               | Identified Barriers  |   |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| r robiem                            | Economic/Financial   | Non-financial   |  |  |  |
|                                     | <ul> <li>High cost of spares and<br/>equipment</li> <li>Limited finance for<br/>replacement costs and<br/>maintenance</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Political appointments</li> <li>Little commitment and interest</li> </ul>                                    |  |  |  |
|                                     | Poor financial management of<br>RWS  | Poor management<br>tradition of Village Water<br>Boards   |  |  |  |
| Limited Institutional               | Board members not paid,<br>mostly voluntary service  | • Fragmented and weak<br>water quality monitoring<br>protocol   |  |  |  |
| Capacity of Village<br>Water Boards | Little investment in basic<br>financial management and<br>improving technical skills<br>(training)   | <ul> <li>Lack of reliable<br/>information and data on<br/>rural water quality and<br/>supply</li> </ul>               |  |  |  |
|                                     | • Some RWS not metered, hence<br>minimum returns for water<br>services and inadequate budget<br>for operation.   | • Very limited knowledge of groundwater resources   |  |  |  |
|                                     | <ul> <li>Water Boards should be<br/>"business oriented", have a<br/>business approach to their<br/>operation, while seeking a<br/>balance for the social needs of<br/>communities</li> </ul> | • Very little study and<br>research done on<br>groundwater capacity,<br>characteristics and sources<br>pollution      |  |  |  |
|                                     |  | • Water authorities and<br>Public Health reactive and<br>not proactive on water<br>supply and water quality<br>issues |  |  |  |

## 4.4 Enabling framework for overcoming the barriers in the Water Sector

The enabling framework for overcoming barriers to the technology transfer for improved management of the threatened Rudimentary Water Systems (RWS) in Belize are summarized in Table 19 below.

| Barriers   | Measures  | Results  | Timeframe  | Responsible  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
|  |   |  | & Cost UD \$   | Entity   |
| Political/Legal<br>-Political<br>appointment of<br>Water Board<br>members;<br>-Low commitment<br>& interest;<br>-Lack of<br>knowledge/skills<br>Economic and<br>Financial<br>-High cost of   | <ul> <li>Village Council<br/>Act reviewed for<br/>possible<br/>amendment</li> <li>Lobby for change<br/>in policy for<br/>appointment/hiring<br/>Village Water</li> <li>Board members</li> <li>Establish training<br/>and management<br/>programme for<br/>technicians and<br/>Village Water</li> <li>Board members</li> <li>Fund procured for<br/>SWP training</li> <li>Conduct annual</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Unlimited<br/>commitment.</li> <li>Extensive knowledge<br/>of system.</li> <li>Contract members of<br/>Village Water Board.</li> <li>Abolished political<br/>appointment of Board<br/>members</li> <li>Improved water<br/>service.</li> </ul> | Short/medium<br>term<br>Estimated<br>Initial Cost:<br>US\$ In-kind<br>GOB<br>Operational<br>cost:<br>US\$ 20,000<br>Short/medium<br>term | Rural<br>Deelopment<br>Dep. (RDD),<br>Public<br>Health, PUC<br>Public<br>Health, RDD |
| <ul> <li>-High cost of<br/>spare, equipment<br/>&amp; chemicals;</li> <li>-Funds<br/>unavailable to<br/>conduct<br/>coordinated WSP<br/>training and<br/>develop<br/>Guidelines (High<br/>initial costs);</li> <li>Poor financial<br/>management of<br/>RWS by some<br/>Water Boards.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Conduct annual<br/>Audit</li> <li>Implement<br/>business-oriented<br/>RWS operation &amp;<br/>management</li> <li>Initial cost for<br/>solar powered<br/>water pumps and<br/>water treatment<br/>chemical procured</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Efficient and reliable<br/>RWS service</li> <li>Spares available (e.g.<br/>electric water pump<br/>run on RE) and<br/>weekly maintenance</li> </ul>   |  |  |
| Non-financial<br>Poor management<br>tradition by<br>Water Boards;<br>Fragmented and<br>weak water<br>quality<br>monitoring<br>protocol;  | - Public Health<br>Bureau develops<br>and implements a<br>timely water<br>quality monitoring<br>protocol for target<br>Rudimentary<br>Water Systems.  | <ul> <li>Decreased use of<br/>untreated water from<br/>other sources</li> <li>Improved health and<br/>nutrition</li> </ul>   | Short term   | Public<br>Health   |

# Table 48: Enabling framework for facilitating technology transfer for improvedmanagement of threatened RWS

| Water authorities<br>and Public<br>Health reactive<br>w/r to water<br>supply and water<br>quality issues   |   |   |                      |                           |
|--|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Culture /<br>Tradition<br>Attitude &<br>perception that<br>water is free;<br>General lack of<br>interest   | <ul> <li>Improved<br/>management<br/>practice of Village<br/>Water Boards</li> <li>Changed "water<br/>free' perception of<br/>clients/villagers</li> <li>Adjudicate<br/>subsidies for poor</li> </ul>                             | <ul> <li>Improved water<br/>service delivery</li> <li>Regular Training of<br/>personnel/Village<br/>Water Board<br/>members</li> <li>Rights to safe potable<br/>water for all.</li> </ul> | Short term           | Public<br>Health,<br>RDD, |
| Sustainability<br>Lack of reliable<br>information and<br>data on rural<br>water quality<br>and supply;<br>Weak institutional<br>/technical<br>capacity | <ul> <li>Metered water<br/>service</li> <li>Set requirement<br/>for qualified<br/>personnel to be<br/>available always</li> <li>Ensure that service<br/>payment funds<br/>available for<br/>spares and<br/>maintenance</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Revolving fund and profits</li> <li>Extensive local knowledge and skill of RWS</li> <li>Less breakdown, reduced waste of water, and reliable deliver service</li> </ul>          | Short/Medium<br>term | RDD, Water<br>Boards,     |

## **CHAPTER 5.** Conclusions

Successful technology transfer requires participation and building on indigenous knowledge. Social, economic and environmental indicators, clearly selected and measurable, should reveal if goals and objectives are being achieved or were achieved. While hardware has taken centre stage in activities and interventions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, processes and institutions are central to building capacity and resilience to the impacts of climate change.

The Barrier Analysis and Enabling Framework Report, together with the National Reports form the basis for the third and final phase of the TNA Process in Belize. Processing six adaptation technologies in this report was a challenge that could not have been realized without the assistance of personnel of the National Climate Change Office and UNEP-DTU. Also, the participation and input of sectoral stakeholders in the small group consultative meetings were clearly the catalyst that facilitated the evaluation of barriers and identifications of feasible measures for the smooth diffusion of the prioritized technologies considered in this Report.

The challenge now is to integrate the relevant information into a Technology Action Plan endorsed and owned by the People and Government of Belize, which actually will be prepared and presented as a bankable portfolio of project concepts, that if realized, will increased, in some way, the country's resilience to climate change and contribute to the livelihood security of many Belizeans in the short and medium term.

- Forest Department, 2006. The Forest Resource Planning and Management Program, Annual Report 2005. Belize Forest Department, Belmopan.
- Frutos, R. 2014. Belize Agriculture Research and Development: An Overview. Agricultural R & D Survey 2014. Research, Development and Innovation Centre, Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resource, Central Farm, Cayo District. ASTI/IFPRI.
- Dhar, S., Painuly, J. and Nygaard, I. and Rogat, J. 2014. Organizing the National TNA Process: An Explanatory Note. UNEP DTU Partnership. Copenhagen.
- Department of Co-operatives, 2014. Listing of Co-operative Societies of Belize: 2013/2014. Department of Co-operatives, Ministry of Agriculture. Belmopan, Belize.
- GOB, 2016. Belize Growth and Sustainable Development Strategy 2016-2019. Ministry of Economic Development, Petroleum, Investment, Trade and Commerce, Government of Belize. Belmopan, Belize.
- GOB/FAO, 2015. Agricultural Water Management Investment Plan. FAO/Government of Belize Project TCP/BZE.
- GOB/FAO, 2011. An Irrigation Policy and Strategy for Belize, 2011. Ministry of Agriculture and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Government of Belize. Project TCP/BZE/3301. Belmopan, Belize.
- GOB/FAO, 2003. Agricultural Development Management and Operational Strategy (ADMOS). Project TCP/BELIZE/2003A. Belmopan, Belize.
- GOB/FAO, 2001. Food and Nutrition Security Policy for Belize 2001 2010. FAO / Government of Belize. Project TCP/BZE/3301. Belmopan, Belize.
- GOB/FAO, 2010. Plan of Action for Disaster Risk Reduction in Agriculture. Ministry of Agriculture and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. TCP BZE 3202, 2010.
- GOB/MNRE, 2010. Belize Environmental Outlook: GEO Belize 2010. Land and Survey Department/University of Belize/UNEP. Belmopan, Belize.
- GOB, 2015. National Agriculture and Food Policy 2015-2030. Ministry of Agriculture, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture (IICA), November, 2015. Belmopan, Belize.
- GOB, 2002. The National Agriculture and Food Policy 2002-2020. Ministry of Agriculture, Belmopan, Belize. http://www.agriculture.gov.bz/
- GOB/CDB/FAO, 2015. Belize Agricultural Water Management Investment Plan, Volume 1. Final Report. FAO/Caribbean Development Bank Cooperative Programme.

Belmopan, Belize.

- GOB/MNRA, 2014. National Agriculture and Food Policy of Belize: 2015-2030. Ministry of Natural Resources and Agriculture. Belmopan, Belize.
- GOB/NCCO, 2016. Belize's Third National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (Draft). Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry, the Environment and Sustainable Development. Belmopan, Belize.
- CCCCC, 2014. A National Adaptation Strategy to Address Climate Change in the Agriculture Sector in Belize. GCCA \_Intra-ACP Programme, EU. CCCCC, the National Climate Change Centre, and Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries and Sustainable Development. Belmopan, Belize.
- CGIAR, 2012. Roots, Tubers and Bananas Research Programme. http://www.cgiar.org/ourstrategy/cgiar-research/
- CIP, 2010. International Potato Centre, 2010. http://www.cipotato.org
- Chung, L., 2011. Irrigation and Drainage Policy and Strategic Development Plan for Belize. *Baseline Report: Irrigation in Belize.* Ministry of Natural Resources and Agriculture. EU/ UNDP/FAO, Belmopan, Belize.
- CZMAI, 2004. The National Integrated Coastal Zone Management Strategy for Belize. Coastal Zone Management Authority and Institute, 2004. Halcrow Group, Belize City. Belize.
- FAO, 2011. Rural Structures in the Tropics: Design and Development, Chap 13 Ventilation. Rome. www.fao.org/docrep/015/i2433e/
- FAO/GOB, 2011. An Irrigation Policy and Strategy for Belize. Irrigation Policy and Strategy: Final Report. PROJECT TCP/BZE/3301: "Irrigation Policy and Strategy". Belmopan, Belize.
- Frutos, R. 2014. Belize Agricultural Research and Development. An Overview.
  ASTI/IFPRI Agriculture R & D Survey, 2014. Research and Development Innovative Center, MNRA. Central Farm, Cayo District, Belize.
  IICA, 2016. 70 Years of History: Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture.
- IPCC, 2000: *Methodological and technological issues in technology transfer*. Bert Metz et al., editors. Special report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press.
- Kumar, K. S., K. N. Tiwari, M. K. Jha, 2009. Design and Technology for Greenhouse Cooling in <u>T</u>ropical and Sub-Tropical Regions: A Review. *Energy and Buildings 41* (2009) 1269 - 1275. Elsevier, www.elsevier.com/locate/enbuild. Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur 721302, India.

NCCO-MAFFESD, 2016. Belize Third National Communication to the United Nations

Framework Convention on Climate Change. Belmopan, Belize.

- Naik, P.S. and Karihaloo, J. L., 2007. Micropropagation for production of Quality Potato Seed in Asia- Pacific. Asia-Pacific Consortium on Agricultural Biotechnology. New Delhi, India, 54.
- Nygaard, I. and Hansen, U. 2015. Overcoming Barriers to the Transfer and Diffusion of Climate Technologies: Second Edition. UNEP DTU Partnership, Copenhagen.
- Parsons, G., 2015. Grower 101: Greenhouse Cooling Options. http://www.gpnmag.com/article/grower-101-greenhouse-cooling-options/
- Perry, C. J., 2015. Irrigation Efficiency Group Discussion. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/cj\_perry
- Piñero, Martin. 2007. Agricultural technology transfer to developing countries and the public sector. Science Development Network. London, UK. <u>https://www.scidev.net/</u>.
- Ramirez, G., 2010. Tropical Greenhouse: Types of Protective Covered Structures in Belize. Publicity Flyer. Central Farm Research and Development. Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry, Environment, and Sustainable Development. Belize.
- Reyes, H., 2010. Protected Agriculture in Belize. PP Presentation. Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institute (CARDI) Belize. Central Farm, Belize.
- Ridell, P. J., 2011. Interim Policy and Strategy, Irrigation Policy Strategy. Project TCP/BZ/3301. FAO/GOB. Belmopan, Belize.
- Rodriguez, A., 2016. Field Manual for Topical Greenhouse Design in Quintana Roo, Mexico.
- Salazar, O., 2013. Protective Structures Survey 2012: Final Report. Crop Research and Development nit, MAFFESD, Belmopan, Belize.
- Shal, V., O. Salas, N. Requena, 2012. Economic Alternatives and Fisheries Diversification Plan. Fisheries Department and Nature Conservancy. Belize City, Belize. (Internal Draft).
- Shamshiri, R., and Wan Ishak Wan Ismael, 2013. A Review of Greenhouse Climate Control and Automation Systems in Tropical Regions. Journal of Agricultural Science and Applications. Volume 2, Issue 3 Sep. 2013 PP. 176-183 asa.org ©
- American V-King Scientific Publishing. USGR, 2015. http://www.usgr.com/cooling\_pads/about\_greenhouse\_evaporative\_cooling\_systems.
- Shrestha, R. B. and Gopalekrishnam, C. 1993. Adoption and Diffusion of Drip Irrigation Technology: An Econometric Analysis. Development Alternatives, Nepal; University of Hawaii at Manoa. Economic Development and Cultural Change. Vol. 41, Number 2, January 1993. www.journal.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/
- Tempo, 2008. Technologies for Adaptation. A bulletin on climate and development. Issue 67, April 2008. London, UK. Bracken Hill Design. Pg. 8.

SIB, 2016. Compendium of Statistics 2015. Statistical Institute of Belize. Retrieved on 15 August, 2017 from www.sib.org.bz.

## ANNEX A1-1: Categorization of prioritized adaptation technologies for the TNA process in Belize Table I-A. 1: Schematic of Goods and Category of TNA Prioritized Technologies



(Source: adopted from Nygaard and Hansen, 2015 and Schumacher 1973; flowchart developed by R. Frutos 2017)

| Goods                   | Category                      | Description   | Market characteristics   | Prioritized Technology   |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Market<br>Goods         | Consumer<br>goods             | -Goods targeting the<br>mass market;<br>households, businesses<br>and institutions.   | <ul> <li>a high number of potential consumers</li> <li>interaction with existing markets and requiring distribution, maintenance and installer networks in the supply chain</li> <li>extended and complicated supply chains with many actors, including producers, assemblers, importers, wholesalers, retailers and end consumers</li> <li>barriers may exist in all steps of supply chain</li> <li>demand depends on consumer awareness and preferences and on commercial marketing and promotional efforts</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Heat and drought resistant variety of open-pollinating corn<br/>and bean seeds for reproduction and marketing.</li> <li>Improved drip irrigation systems using rainwater<br/>harvesting and fertigation for crop nutrient requirement.</li> <li>In-country Irish potato clean-stock production unit to<br/>produce quality seed-tuber planting material varieties.</li> <li>Rehabilitation of crop cover structure cooling systems</li> </ul> |
| -                       | Capital<br>goods              | Machinery and<br>equipment used in the<br>production of goods, e.g.<br>consumer goods or<br>electricity or agro-<br>processing products   | <ul> <li>a limited number of potential sites/consumers</li> <li>relatively large capital investment</li> <li>simpler market chain, i.e. few or no existing technology providers</li> <li>demand is profit-driven and depends on demand for the products the capital goods are used to make</li> </ul>  |  |
|                         | Publicly<br>provided<br>goods | Technologies in this<br>category are often<br>(although not always)<br>publicly owned, and<br>production of goods and<br>services are available<br>(free or paid) to the<br>public or large group | <ul> <li>very few sites</li> <li>large investment, government/donor funding</li> <li>public ownership or own by large companies</li> <li>simple market chain; technology procured through national or international tenders.</li> <li>investments in large-scale technologies tend to be decided at the government level and heavily dependent on existing infrastructure and policies.</li> </ul>   |  |
| Non-<br>market<br>Goods | Other non-<br>market<br>goods | Non-tradable<br>technologies transferred<br>and diffused under non-<br>market conditions:<br>governments, public or<br>non-profit institutions,<br>foreign donors or NGOs                         | <ul> <li>technologies are not transferred as part of a market<br/>but within a public non-commercial domain.</li> <li>serves overall political objectives, such as energy<br/>saving and poverty alleviation</li> <li>donor or government funding</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Improved environmental monitoring network and early<br/>warning system for Belize's coastal zone to increase<br/>resilience to climate change.</li> <li>An integrated management strategy for water safety for<br/>rural water supply systems in Belize</li> </ul>  |

## Table A1-2: Categorization of Prioritized Adaptation Technologies

(Source: adopted from Nygaard and Hansen, 2015)
|                |  | Non-  | Market Goods                                 |  |
|----------------|--|---|--|--|
|                |  |   | Other Non-Market Goods                       | 5  |
|                | Publicly Provided Goods                        | I. Technologies Provided by                     | II. Institutional Change:                    | III. Behavioural Change at the                         |
|                |  | Public Institutions                             | Improved Rural Livelihood                    | Individual Level (Change of Practice)                  |
| Examples       | -Large infrastructure                          | <ul> <li>Early warning system for</li> </ul>    | <ul> <li>Forest management groups</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Energy-saving/efficiency measures,</li> </ul> |
|                | projects;                                      | drought;  | and village councils                         | e.g. new types of electric bulbs (LCD                  |
|                | <ul> <li>-Large capital investment;</li> </ul> | - Environmental Monitoring                      | - Micro finance institutions                 | over incandescent)                                     |
|                | -May depend on donor                           | Network & Early Warning System                  | - Water Safety Plans (WSP) for               | - Individual cars to public transport and              |
|                | funding;                                       | for Coastal and Marine                          | rural water systems (set of                  | bicycles   |
|                | -Political decision at                         | Resources & Ecosystems                          | actors along with Village                    | <ul> <li>Changing farm practices</li> </ul>            |
|                | government level                               | Management/Use;                                 | Water Boards)                                | - Changing attitude and perception of                  |
|                | <ul> <li>large hydro dams;</li> </ul>          | - Seasonal Weather Forecasts,                   |  | the benefits of climate change                         |
|                | - New highway                                  | etc.  |  | adaptation technologies                                |
|                | infrastructure;                                |   |  |  |
|                | - Modern airport etc.                          |   |  |  |
| Requirements & | -Investment preceded by                        | - Feasibility studies and CBA                   | - Socio-economic CBA                         | <ul> <li>Conduct a KAP survey among key</li> </ul>     |
| impacts        | socio economic CBA                             | lacking;  | - Infrastructure and/or                      | stakeholders   |
|                | -EIA   | - Institutional capacity                        | incumbent technology in place                | -  |
|                | - Impacts a large group of                     | - Trained personnel/technicians                 | - Impacts community (health,                 | -  |
|                | actors/stakeholders;                           | <ul> <li>Difficulty to access funds;</li> </ul> | livelihood and security)                     |  |
|                | -Positive/negative impacts                     | - Political will.                               |  |  |
|                | not equally shared by                          |   |  |  |
|                | affected actors;                               |   |  |  |
|                | e.gLarge hydro dams,                           |   |  |  |
|                | resettlement of rural                          |   |  |  |
|                | poor, loss of tourist sites                    |   |  |  |
|                | and farmland, lower                            |   |  |  |
|                | electricity prices for urban                   |   |  |  |
|                | dwellers, employment                           |   |  |  |
|                | ouring construction, Job                       |   |  |  |
| Derriers te    | Cow foosibility studies and                    | Dankahla project proposala                      | Difficulty according finance                 | Difficulty accessing finance                           |
| Barriers to    | - rew reasibility studies and                  | - Bankable project proposals                    | - Difficulty accessing finance               | - Difficulty accessing finance                         |
| procurement    |  | lacking   | -  | - weak capacity to write bankable                      |
|                | - Difficulty accessing finance                 | - Donors/Tunaing sources                        | -  | project proposais                                      |
|                | - Resistance by locals and                     | inaccessible                                    |  | <ul> <li>Lack of knowledge of sources of</li> </ul>    |

# Table A1- 3: Sample of technologies and related barriers for Non-Market Goods

|   | international NGOs  | - High capital/initial cost  |  | finance   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Barriers to long-term<br>sustainability | <ul> <li>Management costs</li> <li>Inadequate management</li> <li>-</li> </ul>                                    | <ul> <li>Availability of budget-line to<br/>carry on after external funding<br/>exhausted</li> <li>Misuse of funds</li> <li>Lack of advocacy to strengthen<br/>cooperation among key actors</li> <li>Poor management</li> </ul>                                  | <ul> <li>Misappropriation of funds</li> <li>Dependency syndrome</li> <li>Availability of budget-line to<br/>carry on after external funding<br/>exhausted</li> <li>Poor management tradition</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Weak institutional capacity</li> <li>Ineffective implementation of<br/>strategic plan</li> <li>External funding stopped,<br/>programmes and related activities<br/>disrupted or reduced</li> </ul> |
| Barriers to<br>Implementation           | <ul> <li>Resistance by locals and<br/>international NGOs</li> <li>Difficulty approving ESIA</li> <li>-</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Experience with similar<br/>technology intervention not<br/>totally successful or mixed</li> <li>Procurement of funding lie with<br/>donors &amp; development agencies</li> <li>Enabling agencies / actors<br/>/policies may not be in place</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Not too good experience with<br/>similar interventions</li> <li>Inaccessible funding</li> <li>Political will</li> <li>Inadequate institutional<br/>capacity</li> </ul>  |   |
| Barriers to Achieving<br>Change         | <ul> <li>Resettlement costs</li> <li>Benefits not equitable</li> <li>-</li> </ul>                                 | <ul> <li>Strategies of dependence on<br/>continued donor finance</li> <li>Negative response to new<br/>technology by some stakeholders</li> <li>Tangible benefits not evident for<br/>some actors</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Political appointment is<br/>common</li> <li>Inadequate technical capacity<br/>among actors</li> <li>Low commitment</li> </ul>  | -   |
| Measures                                | -   | -  | <ul> <li>Contract regulations (hire actors instead of appointment)</li> <li>Improve training</li> <li>Better project preparation among key actors</li> <li>Improve project management</li> <li>Better understanding donor/recipient relations</li> </ul> | -   |

(Source: adopted from Nygaard and Hansen, 2015)

| <b>ANNEX I-B:</b> | Grain and | Potato | Production | Statistics, | 2010 - | 1016 |
|-------------------|-----------|--------|------------|-------------|--------|------|
|-------------------|-----------|--------|------------|-------------|--------|------|

| BELIZE              |                      | lbs         | ton         | Acre              | Hectare     |             |                |                |           |
|---------------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|-----------|
| Grain and Potato    | Production           | 2204.6      | 1           | 1                 | 0.4047      |             |                |                |           |
| PRODUCTS            | 2010                 | 2011        | 2012        | 2013              | 2014        | 2015        | 2016 (P)       | Averag         | e Yields  |
| GRAINS, BEANS       |                      |             |             |                   |             |             |                | (lbs)/acre     | tons/ha   |
| BLACK BEANS         |                      |             |             |                   |             |             |                |                |           |
| Mechanized          |                      |             |             |                   |             |             |                |                |           |
| Production (lbs)    | 925,900              | 680,600     | 1,719,400   | 243,600           | 422,900     | 1,089,100   | 1,255,000      | 905,214        | 410.60    |
| Acres               | 994                  | 700         | 1,607       | 398               | 795         | 1,202       | 1,993          | 1,098.4        | 444.53    |
| Yield (lb)          | 931                  | 972         | 1,070       | 612               | 532         | 906         | 630            | 824.10         | 0.92      |
| Milpa               |                      |             |             |                   |             |             |                |                |           |
| Production (lbs)    | 2,964,380            | 3,339,100   | 5,251,800   | 4,262,420         | 4,807,965   | 5,547,000   | 430,200        | 3,800,409.29   | 1,723.85  |
| Acres               | 3,135                | 3,317       | 4,724       | 3,855             | 4,147       | 7,021       | 448            | 3,806.71       | 1,540.58  |
| Yield               | 946                  | 1,007       | 1,112       | 1,106             | 1,159       | 790         | 960            | 998.34         | 1.12      |
| Total Production    | 3,890,280            | 4,019,700   | 6,971,200   | 4,506,020         | 5,230,865   | 6,636,100   | 1,685,200      |                |           |
| Total Acres         | 4,129                | 4,017       | 6,331       | 4,253             | 4,942       | 8,223       | 2,441          |                |           |
| R.K. BEANS          |                      |             |             |                   |             |             |                |                |           |
| Milpa:              |                      |             |             |                   |             |             |                |                |           |
| Production (lbs)    | 682,860              | 1,175,875   | 1,312,050   | 943,760           | 854,075     | 459,375     | 439,870        | 838,266.4      | 380.2     |
| Acres               | 796                  | 1,300       | 1,513       | 1,176             | 875         | 385         | 498            | 934.7          | 378.3     |
| Yield (lb)          | 858                  | 905         | 867         | 803               | 976         | 1,193       | 883            | 896.82         | 1.01      |
| Mechanized:         |                      |             |             |                   |             |             |                |                |           |
| Production (lbs)    | 13,890,300           | 6,991,400   | 12,006,200  | 11,535,400        | 9,486,275   | 20,779,500  | 9,240,500      | 11,989,939.3   | 5,438.6   |
| Acres               | 16,650               | 11,400      | 12,869      | 19,594            | 16,010      | 23,759      | 16,207         | 16,641.3       | 6,734.7   |
| Yield (lbs)         | 834                  | 613         | 933         | 589               | 593         | 875         | 570            | 720.49         | 0.81      |
| Total production    | 14,573,160           | 8,167,275   | 13,318,250  | 12,479,160        | 10,340,350  | 21,238,875  | 9,680,370      |                |           |
| total acres         | 17,446               | 12,700      | 14,382      | 20,770            | 16,885      | 24,144      | 16,705         |                |           |
| CORN Yellow         |                      |             |             |                   |             |             |                |                |           |
| Milpa:              | 10.00 ( 000          | 0.504.450   |             | <b>F</b> 00 ( 000 | 5 10 C 50 C | 4 020 505   | 1 222 450      |                |           |
| Production (lbs)    | 10,236,800           | 9,524,450   | 5,604,019   | 7,806,093         | 5,106,706   | 4,938,585   | 1,333,450      | 6,364,300.43   | 2,886.83  |
| Acres               | 7,163                | 6,206       | 4,146       | 6,065             | 5,463       | 5,101       | 1,306          | 5,064.29       | 2,049.52  |
| Yield (lb)          | 1,429                | 1,535       | 1,352       | 1,287             | 935         | 968         | 1,021          | 1,256.70       | 1.41      |
| Niechanized:        | 80.017.500           | 00 868 500  | 114 971 070 | 120 126 990       | 140 265 242 | 106 117 200 | 125 604 765    |                | 52 453 05 |
| A area              | 89,017,300<br>26,512 | 99,808,300  | 20.021      | 38 100            | 25 402      | 22.084      | 155,094,705    | 117,853,165.29 | 53,457.85 |
| Acres<br>Viold (lb) | 20,313               | 3 576       | 29,021      | 3642              | 3052        | 32,904      | 2 746          | 34,220.14      | 13,848.89 |
| Mach Irrig          | 3,338                | 5,570       | 3,938       | 3,042             | 3,952       | 3 850 000   | 2,740          | 3,443.97       | 3.80      |
| Acres harvested     |                      |             |             |                   |             | 700         |                |                |           |
| Total production    | 99.254.300           | 109.392.950 | 120,475,989 | 146.942.973       | 145.372.048 | 114.905.785 | 137.028.215    |                |           |
| Total acres         | 33.676               | 34.130      | 33,167      | 44.264            | 40.955      | 38,785      | 50,714         |                |           |
| CORN White          |                      | - ,         |             | , -               | -,          |             |                |                |           |
| Milpa:              |                      |             |             |                   |             |             |                |                |           |
| Production (lbs)    | 15,565,631           | 15,314,025  | 8,816,478   | 8,893,550         | 4,031,587   | 5,110,628   | 712,180        | 8,349,154.14   | 3,787.15  |
| Acres               | 11,130               | 9,354       | 6,237       | 6,123             | 4,109       | 5,212       | 714            | 6,125.57       | 2,479.02  |
| Yield (lb)          | 1,399                | 1,637       | 1,414       | 1,452             | 981         | 981         |                | 1,363.00       | 1.53      |
| Mechanized:         |                      |             |             |                   |             |             |                |                |           |
| Production (lbs)    | 13,155,400           | 13,534,200  | 10,637,510  | 2,730,920         | 3,087,000   | 7,193,000   | 7,237,600      | 8,225,090.00   | 3,730.88  |
| Acres               | 4,189                | 4,563       | 3,416       | 1,249             | 1,683       | 5,782       | 3,138          | 3,431.43       | 1,388.70  |
| Yield (lb)          | 3,140                | 2,966       | 3,114       | 2,186             | 1,834       | 1,244       | 2,306          | 2,396.99       | 2.69      |
| Total production    | 28,721,031           | 28,848,225  | 19,453,988  | 11,624,470        | 7,118,587   | 12,303,628  | 7,949,780      |                |           |
| Total acres         | 15,319               | 13,917      | 9,653       | 7,372             | 5,792       | 10,994      | 3,852          |                |           |
| PRODUCTS            | 2010                 | 2011        | 2012        | 2013              | 2014        | 2015        | 2016 (P)       | Averag         | e Yields  |
| Irish Potato        |                      |             |             |                   |             |             |                | (lbs)/acre     | tons/ha   |
| Production (lbs)    | 1,809,500            | 2,473,000   | 3,014,000   | 2,231,000         | 2,379,737   | 2,240,300   | 2,173,000      | 2,331,505.3    | 1,057.6   |
| Acres               | 222                  | 251         | 277         | 108               | 224         | 214         | 245            | 220.1          | 89.1      |
| Yields              | 8,151                | 9,853       | 10,881      | 20,658            | 10,624      | 10,469      | 8 <i>,</i> 869 | 10,590.9       | 11.9      |

(Source: M. Truijillo, Agronomist, MOA, Jan. 2018)

# **ANNEX I-C: Cost-Benefit Review for Agriculture Sector Technologies**

# Cost-Benefit Analysis for Cultivation of One and 15 Acres of Incumbent Yellow Corn

| ESTIMATE                                    | D COST OF PRODUCTION FOR O       | NEACREOF       | YELLOW CO          | RN FOR SEED PRO      | ODUCTION                                     |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------------|--|
| Planting System:                            | Mechanized/Commercial Production |                |                    |                      |  |
| Av. Yield - lbs/acre:                       | 2000                             |                |                    |                      |  |
| Date:                                       | Feb-18                           |                |                    |                      |  |
| Updated By:                                 | Manuel Trujillo                  |                |                    |                      |  |
|   |                                  |                |                    |                      |  |
| Activity                                    | Unit                             | Quantity       | Unit               | Cost                 |  |
|   |                                  |                | Cost \$            | 1 acre               |  |
| Ploughing                                   | acre                             | 1              | \$ 50.00           | \$ 50.00             | Heavy disk ploughing                         |
| Harrowing                                   | acre                             | 1              | \$ 75.00           | \$ 75.00             |  |
| Planting & Fertilizing                      | acre                             | 1              | \$ 25.00           | \$ 25.00             |  |
| Herbicide application                       | acre                             | 1              | \$ 12.00           | \$ 12.00             | 1 application                                |
| Insecticide application                     | acre                             | 2              | \$ 12.00           | \$ 24.00             | 2 applications                               |
| Inter-row cultivation                       | acre                             | 1              | \$ 20.00           | \$ 20.00             | 1 pass                                       |
|   |                                  |                |                    |                      |  |
| Inputs                                      |                                  |                |                    |                      |  |
| Seeds - CARDI YC -001                       |                                  | 30             | \$ 3.00            | \$ 90.00             |  |
| Fertilizer - 14-36-12                       | 110-lb bag                       | 1              | \$ 52.00           | \$ 52.00             | Fertilizer is applied at planting            |
| Urea  | 110-lb bag                       | 1              | \$ 40.00           | \$ 40.00             | Fertilizer is applied 5 weeks after planting |
| Primero (herbicide)                         | acre                             | 1              | \$ 41.00           | \$ 41.00             | Selective, post-emergent herbicide           |
| Cypermethrin 25EC                           | liter                            | 0.4            | \$ 35.00           | \$ 14.00             | Control of army worms                        |
| Round-up                                    | Gallon                           | 0.5            | \$ 53.00           | \$ 26.50             |  |
| Rimone (insecticide)                        | liter                            | 0.4            | \$ 185.00          | \$ 74.00             | Systemic conrol of armyworm                  |
| Bull grass                                  | liter                            | 0.5            | 19.00              | 9.50                 |  |
| Harvesting/Post-Harvest                     |                                  |                |                    |                      |  |
| Harvesting (Combine)                        | acre                             | 1              | \$ 50.00           | \$ 50.00             | Mositure content 25%                         |
| Transportation                              | 100 lb-bag                       | 30             | \$ 1.50            | \$ 45.00             |  |
| Drying                                      | 100-lb bag                       | 30             | \$ 3.00            | \$ 90.00             | Dried at Moisture content from 25% to 14%    |
| Cleaning                                    | 100 lbs-bag                      | 20             | \$ 3.00            | \$ 60.00             |  |
| Bags for pacckaging                         | 100 lbs-bag                      | 20             | \$ 0.75            | \$ 15.00             |  |
| Storage                                     | bags                             | 20             | \$ 1.50            | \$ 30.00             |  |
| Total                                       |                                  |                |                    | \$ 843.00            |  |
| Cost Benefit Analysis                       |                                  |                |                    |                      |  |
|   |                                  |                |                    |                      |  |
|   |                                  | Wholesale      |                    |                      |  |
| Dry Weight Corn (14%)                       | Av. Yield lbs/Ac                 | Price/lb       | <b>Total Sales</b> |                      |  |
|   | 2000                             | \$ 1.50        | \$ 3,000.00        |                      |  |
|   |                                  |                |                    |                      |  |
| Cost of production from planting to storage |                                  |                | \$ 843.00          |                      |  |
| Net Profit                                  |                                  |                | \$ 2,157.00        |                      |  |
|   |                                  |                |                    |                      |  |
|   |                                  |                |                    |                      |  |
| Cost of Producing 15 acres of corn          | Yield of 15 acres of Corn        | Price/lb of co | orn seed           | Projected Sales in 2 | 15 acres                                     |
|   | 30000                            | \$ 1.50        |                    | \$ 45,000.00         |  |
|   |                                  |                |                    |                      |  |
|   |                                  |                |                    | \$ 8,430.00          |  |
|   |                                  |                |                    |                      |  |
| Net Profit                                  |                                  |                |                    | \$ 36,570.00         |  |

(Source: M. Truijillo, Agronomist, MOA, Jan. 2018)

### Cost-Benefit Analysis for Cultivation of One and 15 Acres of Incumbent beans

| ESTIMATED COST OF PROD                      | <b>UCTION FOR ONE</b> A | ACRE OF BLAC    | KAI   | ND SMALL H     | RED BEAN | NS SI | EED PRODUCTION                      |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------|-------|----------------|----------|-------|-------------------------------------|
| Planting System:                            | Semi Mechanized/Co      | mmercial Produc | tion  |                |          |       |                                     |
| Av. Yield - lbs/acre:                       | 1000                    |                 |       |                |          |       |                                     |
| Date:                                       | Feb. 2018               |                 |       |                |          |       |                                     |
| Updated By:                                 | Manuel Trujillo         | Agronomist, Mi  | nistı | ry of Agricult | ure      |       |                                     |
|   | Belize                  |                 |       |                |          |       |                                     |
| Activity                                    | Unit                    | Quantity        |       | Unit           | Cost B   | ZD    |                                     |
|   |                         |                 |       | Cost \$        | 1 acr    | e     |                                     |
| Ploughing                                   | acre                    | 1               | \$    | 50.00          | \$ 50    | 0.00  | Heavy disk ploughing                |
| Harrowing                                   | acre                    | 1               | \$    | 75.00          | \$ 7!    | 5.00  |                                     |
| Planting & Fertilizing                      | acre                    | 1               | \$    | 25.00          | \$ 2!    | 5.00  |                                     |
| Herbicide application                       | acre                    | 1               | \$    | 12.00          | \$ 12    | 2.00  | 2 applications                      |
| Insecticide application                     | acre                    | 2               | \$    | 12.00          | \$ 24    | 4.00  | 2 applications                      |
| Inter-row cultivation                       | acre                    | 1               | \$    | 20.00          | \$ 20    | 0.00  | 1 pass                              |
| Inputs                                      |                         |                 |       |                | \$       | -     |                                     |
| Seeds                                       | lbs                     | 25              | \$    | 5.00           | \$ 12    | 5.00  |                                     |
| Fertilizer - 14:36:12                       | 110-lb bag              | 1               | \$    | 52.00          | \$ 52    | 2.00  | Fertilizer is applied at planting   |
| Flex  | liter                   | 0.3             | \$    | 80.00          | \$ 24    | 4.00  | Selective herbicide for broadleaves |
| Round up                                    | gal                     | 0.5             | \$    | 54.00          | \$ 2     | 7.00  |                                     |
| Antracol                                    | pk                      | 1               | \$    | 25.00          | \$ 2!    | 5.00  | Fungicide                           |
| Deltametrina                                | liter                   | 0.25            | \$    | 35.00          | \$ 3     | 8.75  | Insecticide                         |
| Spreader sticker                            | liter                   | 0.5             | \$    | 9.00           | \$ 4     | 4.50  |                                     |
|   |                         |                 |       |                | \$       | -     |                                     |
| Harvesting/Post-Harvest                     |                         |                 |       |                | \$       | -     |                                     |
| Manual Harvesting (uprooting and winrowing) | acre                    | 1               |       | BZ\$85.00      | \$ 8     | 5.00  |                                     |
| Winrowng                                    | acre                    | 1               |       | BZ\$20.00      | \$ 20    | 0.00  |                                     |
| Harvesting (Combine)                        | acre                    | 1               | \$    | 40.00          | \$ 40    | 0.00  |                                     |
| Transportation                              | 100 lb-bags             | 10              | \$    | 1.50           | \$ 1!    | 5.00  |                                     |
| Drying                                      | 100 lb-bags             | 10              | \$    | 2.50           | \$ 2!    | 5.00  |                                     |
| Cleaning                                    | 100lb-bags              | 10              | \$    | 3.00           | \$ 30    | 0.00  |                                     |
| Storage                                     | 100-lb-bags             | 10              | \$    | 1.25           | \$ 12    | 2.50  |                                     |
| Baging                                      | bags                    | 10              | \$    | 0.75           | \$       | 7.50  |                                     |
| Total Input Cost                            |                         |                 |       |                | \$ 70    | 7.25  |                                     |
|   |                         |                 |       |                |          |       |                                     |
| Cost Benefit Analysis                       |                         |                 |       |                |          |       |                                     |
|   | Av. Yield lbs/Ac        | Price/lb        |       | Total          |          |       |                                     |
|   | 1000                    | \$ 2.00         | \$    | 2,000.00       |          |       |                                     |
| Cost of production                          |                         |                 | \$    | 707.25         |          |       |                                     |
| Net Profit/acre                             |                         |                 | \$    | 1,292.75       |          |       |                                     |
|   |                         |                 |       |                |          |       |                                     |
|   | Yield lbs for 15 acres  | Price/lb        | Р     | roject Sales   |          |       |                                     |
|   | 15000                   | \$ 2.00         | \$    | 30,000.00      |          |       |                                     |
|   |                         |                 |       |                |          |       |                                     |
|   | Cost per acre           | Acres Planted   | Tot   | tal Cost of Pr | oduction |       |                                     |
| Cost of Production/acre                     | \$ 707.25               | 15              | \$    | 10,608.75      |          |       |                                     |
|   |                         |                 |       |                |          |       |                                     |
| Net Profit                                  |                         |                 | \$    | 19,391.25      |          |       |                                     |

(Source: M. Truijillo, Agronomist, MOA, Jan. 2018)

#### **Irish Potato Cultivation**

Estimated cost for cultivation of 'one' acre of incumbent Potato variety in 2012 without irrigation

| Activity         | Unit | Amount | Unit Cost BZ\$ | Total BZ\$ |
|------------------|------|--------|----------------|------------|
| Land preparation | acre | 1      | 120.00         | 120.00     |
| Seeds            | lb   | 800    | 1.05           | 840.00     |
| Bags             | bag  | 100    | 1.00           | 100.00     |

1

| Fertilizers    |      |    |        | 681.00   |
|----------------|------|----|--------|----------|
| Pesticides     |      |    | 285.00 | 285.00   |
| Labour         |      |    |        | 1,348.00 |
| Transportation |      |    |        | 250.00   |
| Storage        | days | 90 | 4.00   | 360.00   |
| Total          |      |    |        | 3,984.00 |

#### (Source: M. Trujillo, A. Pulido, and D. Nabet, 2012. Irish Potato Planting Guide. MOA, Dec. 4, 2012)

| Yields (lbs/acre)                              | 10,000         |
|--|----------------|
| Price/lb (Wholesale)                           | \$<br>0.60     |
| Total Return                                   | \$<br>6,000.00 |
| Total Return                                   | \$<br>6,000.00 |
| Estimated Cost of Production (without Storage) | \$<br>3,624.00 |
| Net Profit (Benefit)                           | \$<br>2,376.00 |

All cost and returns are 2012 values. Prices fluctuate as economic conditions changes.

*Note:* Clean, certified Irish potato seed-tubers replicated locally through micro-propagation of imported climate resilient, 'source basic seed' would probably be twice the cost of a unit of incumbent seeds, but GOB subsidy would make it affordable for farmers. Certified seeds-tubers will be climate resilient and tested to be more adaptable to warmer and drier conditions and yields per acre or hectare can be higher with the appropriate input. Initial cost for drip irrigation (if used) is not included, but the benefits to potato growers would be profitable in the short and medium term. If storage is available, farmers will very likely be able to fetch higher prices per unit weight of their potato as market demands increase.

The killer barrier for this technology transfer is the capital costs and time constraints for improving the UB Micro-Propagation Laboratory facilities and technical capacity; and accelerating the actual micro-propagation of imported 'Source Basic Seeds (i.e. clean parent material), to micro-tuberization, reproduction of mini-tubers in screen houses (protective covered structures), and then mini-tuber germination to produce certified seed tubers for farmers. However, the propagation of new batches of clean, planting material will be staggered and ongoing, once the process commences; so, there will always be mini-tubers in storage and germinating, to produce more certified seed tubers for growers. Trials on different varieties of potato could be encourage at random, specifically for varieties that meet certain market demand, both locally and regionally, and in this way, Belize may be able to develop a profitable, potato production industry.

#### Cost of Production for 1 acre of irrigated potato in the Orange Walk District for the 2014

cropping season Variety: *Red La Rouge, Pontiac* Total Revenue: Yield (lbs/acre): 25,000 Market Price: BZ\$ 0.85/lb. \$ 21,250.00 Estimated Net: \$ 13,267.95

| Input & Activity          | Unit              | Cost/Unit | Quantity | Cost BZ\$ | Sub-total |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
|                           |                   |           |          |           |           |
| <b>Total Land Prepar</b>  | ration            |           |          |           | 332.50    |
|                           |                   |           |          |           |           |
| Total Labour              |                   |           |          |           | 1,560.00  |
| Seeds                     |                   | 1.05      | 1,000    | 1,050.00  | 1,050.00  |
| Newgibs                   | 1 pk. (100 grams) | 17.00     | 1        | 17.00     | 17.00     |
| Inputs (Seeds & N         | ew Gib)           |           |          |           | 1,067.00  |
|                           |                   |           |          |           |           |
| Total Herbicide           |                   |           |          |           | 174.80    |
|                           |                   |           |          |           |           |
| Total Insecticide         |                   |           |          |           | 392.00    |
|                           |                   |           |          |           |           |
| Total Fungicide           |                   |           |          |           | 850.50    |
|                           |                   |           |          |           |           |
| Total Fertilizer          |                   |           |          |           | 786.70    |
|                           |                   |           |          |           |           |
| Post Harvest Cost         | s                 |           |          |           | 325.00    |
|                           |                   |           |          |           |           |
| <b>Total Input (BZ\$)</b> |                   |           |          |           | 5,488.50  |
|                           |                   |           |          |           |           |

(Source of data: M. Trujillo, Fruit Trees and Crop Production Unit, MOA, Central Farm, 2014)

With Irrigation System

| Equipment              | Unit | Cost per Unit BZ\$ | Total BZ\$ |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|------------|
| 5 Hp Gasoline pump     | 1    | 1,400.00           | 1,400.00   |
| 2 " Main pipe rolls    | 1    | 575.00             | 575.00     |
| Rolls T-tape           | 1    | 675.00             | 675.00     |
| Take Off               | 117  | 3.50               | 409.50     |
| Gallons fuel           | 40   | 10.73              | 429.20     |
| Lubricants 10% of fuel | 0.1  | 429.20             | 42.92      |
| Accessories fittings   | 1    | 300.00             | 300.00     |
| TOTAL                  |      |                    | 3,831.62   |

Fixed and variable costs

| Fixed costs              | Cost     | Depreciation | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      |
|--------------------------|----------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                          |          | Years        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Equipment & Material     |          |              |        |        |        |        |        |
| 5 Hp Gasoline pump       | 1,400.00 | 5            | 280.00 | 280.00 | 280.00 | 280.00 | 280.00 |
| 2 "Main pipe             | 575.00   | 2            | 288.00 | 288.00 |        |        |        |
| Bi-wall                  | 675.00   | 1            | 675.00 |        |        |        |        |
| Take Off                 | 409.50   | 2            | 205.00 | 205.00 |        |        |        |
| Accessories and fittings | 300.00   | 1            | 300.00 |        |        |        |        |

1

| Total                   | 1,747.00 | 772.00 | 280.00 | 280.00 | 280.00 |
|-------------------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                         |          |        |        |        |        |
| Variable Costs          |          |        |        |        |        |
| Fuel                    | 429.20   |        |        |        |        |
| Lubricants              | 42.92    |        |        |        |        |
| Total Inputs            | 5,488.50 |        |        |        |        |
| 5% Inputs Contingency   | 274.43   |        |        |        |        |
| TOTAL COSTS/ACRE POTATO | 7,982.05 |        |        |        |        |

Summary of Potato Production-One Acre, Irrigated

| Yield per acre in pounds (lbs) | 25,000          |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| Market Price per lb BZ\$       | \$<br>0.85      |
| Gross Income BZ\$              | \$<br>21,250.00 |
|                                |                 |
| Total Expenditure/acre         | \$<br>7,982.05  |
| Net Income                     | \$<br>13,267.95 |
|                                |                 |
| Unit cost of product           | \$<br>0.32      |

# **Chemical Species**

- CO Carbon monoxide
- CO<sub>2</sub> Carbon dioxide
- CH<sub>4</sub> Methane
- H<sub>2</sub> Hydrogen gas
- N<sub>2</sub>O Nitrous oxide
- NO<sub>2</sub> Nitrogen dioxide

# ANNEX I-D: Model Output to Assess Impacts of some Measures for Diffusion of Technologies

Impacts of measures for diffusion of improved Yellow Corn seeds

| Assessing sets of measures for improve | ed maize seeds  |                |          |          |           | INPUT CEL   | LS IN YELLO | SW     |        |        |          |         |
|--|-----------------|----------------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|----------|---------|
| Assumptions                            | Increased yield |                | 3.86     | tonne/ha |           | Disc. rate  |             | 0.1    |        |        |          |         |
|  |                 |                |          |          |           |             |             |        |        |        |          |         |
| Text                                   | Unit            | Total 10 years | year 1   | year 2   | year 3    | year 4      | year 5      | year 6 | year 7 | year 8 | year 9   | year 10 |
| Impact                                 |                 |                |          |          |           |             |             |        |        |        |          |         |
| ha with improved (baseline)            | 1000            | 22.3           | 1        | 1.1      | 1.2       | 1.3         | 1.4         | 1.5    | 2.8    | 3      | 4        | 5       |
| ha with improved (programme)           | 1000            | 44.6           | 2        | 2.2      | 2.4       | 2.6         | 2.8         | 3      | 5.6    | 6      | 8        | 10      |
| Effect (ha with improved seeds)        | 1000            | 22.3           | 1        | 1.1      | 1.2       | 1.3         | 1.4         | 1.5    | 2.8    | 3      | 4        | 5       |
| Programme costs                        |                 | NPV            |          |          |           |             |             |        |        |        |          |         |
| Subsidty on seeds per ha               | USD             |                | 30       | 30       | 25        | 20          | 20          | 20     | 10     | 5      | 0        | 0       |
| Subsidy on seeds                       | M USD           | 0.3            | 0.06     | 0.066    | 0.06      | 0.052       | 0.056       | 0.06   | 0.056  | 0.03   | 0        | 0       |
| Introduction package                   | M USD           | 24.5           | 27       | 0        | 0         | 0           | 0           | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0        | 0       |
| Awareness campaign                     | M USD           | 3.8            | 1        | 1        | 1         | 1           | 1           | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0        | 0       |
| to be specified                        |                 |                |          |          |           |             |             |        |        |        |          |         |
| Program administration                 | M USD           | 2.7            | 0.5      | 0.5      | 0.5       | 0.5         | 0.5         | 0.5    | 0.5    | 0.5    | 0        | 0       |
| Total programme cost (NPV)             | M USD           | 31.3           | 28.56    | 1.566    | 1.56      | 1.552       | 1.556       | 0.56   | 0.556  | 0.53   | 0        | 0       |
|  |                 |                |          |          |           |             |             |        |        |        |          |         |
| Benefits                               | 1000            |                |          |          |           |             |             |        |        |        |          |         |
| Increased production                   | tonnes          | 86.1           | 3.86     | 4.246    | 4.632     | 5.018       | 5.404       | 5.79   | 10.808 | 11.58  | 15.44    | 19.3    |
| Cost vs. benefits                      |                 |                |          |          |           |             |             |        |        |        |          |         |
| Programme costs/tonne of extra yield   |                 | 363.7          | USD/tonn | e maíze  | Market pr | ice for mai | ze          |        |        | 110    | USD/tonn | e       |



(Source: After Nygaard and Hansen, 2015)

#### Impacts of measures for diffusion of improved Black / Small Red Beans seeds

| Assessing sets of measures for imp   | roved s  | eeds     |         |           |          | INPUT C     | <mark>ells in yi</mark> | ELLOW  |        |        |         |         |
|--------------------------------------|----------|----------|---------|-----------|----------|-------------|-------------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|
| Black and Small Red Beans            |          |          |         |           |          |             |                         |        |        |        |         |         |
| Assumptions                          | Increase | ed yield | 0.81    | tonne/h   | а        | Disc. rat   | e                       | 10%    |        |        |         |         |
|                                      |          |          |         |           |          |             |                         |        |        |        |         |         |
|                                      |          | Total 10 |         |           |          |             |                         |        |        |        |         |         |
| Text                                 | Unit     | years    | year 1  | year 2    | year 3   | year 4      | year 5                  | year 6 | year 7 | year 8 | year 9  | year 10 |
| Impact                               |          |          |         |           |          |             |                         |        |        |        |         |         |
| ha with improved (baseline)          | 1000     | 17.9     | 0.4     | 0.6       | 0.7      | 0.8         | 0.9                     | 2      | 2.2    | 2.5    | 3.8     | 4       |
| ha with improved (programme)         | 1000     | 35.8     | 0.8     | 1.2       | 1.4      | 1.6         | 1.8                     | 4      | 4.4    | 5      | 7.6     | 8       |
| Effect (ha with improved seeds)      | 1000     | 17.9     | 0.4     | 0.6       | 0.7      | 0.8         | 0.9                     | 2      | 2.2    | 2.5    | 3.8     | 4       |
| Programme costs                      |          | NPV      |         |           |          |             |                         |        |        |        |         |         |
| Subsidty on seeds per ha             | USD      |          | 20.0    | 20.0      | 15.0     | 20.0        | 20.0                    | 20.0   | 10.0   | 5.0    | -       | -       |
| Subsidy on seeds                     | M USD    | 0.2      | 0.0     | 0.0       | 0.0      | 0.0         | 0.0                     | 0.1    | 0.0    | 0.0    | -       | -       |
| Introduction package                 | M USD    | 24.5     | 27.0    | -         | -        | -           | -                       | -      | -      | -      | -       | -       |
| Awareness campaign                   | M USD    | 3.8      | 1.0     | 1.0       | 1.0      | 1.0         | 1.0                     | -      | -      | -      | -       | -       |
| to be specified                      |          |          |         |           |          |             |                         |        |        |        |         |         |
| Program administration               | M USD    | 2.7      | 0.5     | 0.5       | 0.5      | 0.5         | 0.5                     | 0.5    | 0.5    | 0.5    | -       | -       |
| Total programme cost (NPV)           | M USD    | 31.2     | 28.5    | 1.5       | 1.5      | 1.5         | 1.5                     | 0.6    | 0.5    | 0.5    | -       | -       |
|                                      |          |          |         |           |          |             |                         |        |        |        |         |         |
| Benefits                             | 1000     |          |         |           |          |             |                         |        |        |        |         |         |
| Increased production                 | tonnes   | 14       | 0       | 0         | 1        | 1           | 1                       | 2      | 2      | 2      | 3       | 3       |
| Cost vs. benefits                    |          |          |         |           |          |             |                         |        |        |        |         |         |
| Programme costs/tonne of extra yield | J        | 2,150    | USD/ton | ine beans | Market p | orice for I | RK Beans                |        |        | 400    | USD/ton | ne      |



Impacts of measures for diffusion of certified Irish potato seed tubers

| Assessing sets of measures for imp   | roved s      | eeds     |         |           |          | INPUT C     | ELLS IN YE | ELLOW  |        |        |         |         |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|----------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|
| Climate Resilient Irish Potato Prod  | uction       |          |         |           |          |             |            |        |        |        |         |         |
| Assumptions                          | Increase     | ed yield | 11.87   | tonne/h   | а        | Disc. rate  | e          | 10%    |        |        |         |         |
|                                      |              |          |         |           |          |             |            |        |        |        |         |         |
|                                      |              | Total 10 |         |           |          |             |            |        |        |        |         |         |
| Text                                 | Unit         | years    | year 1  | year 2    | year 3   | year 4      | year 5     | year 6 | year 7 | year 8 | year 9  | year 10 |
| Impact                               |              |          |         |           |          |             |            |        |        |        |         |         |
| ha with improved (baseline)          | 1000         | 6.429    | 0.089   | 0.09      | 0.1      | 0.15        | 0.2        | 0.4    | 0.6    | 0.8    | 1       | 3       |
| ha with improved (programme)         | 1000         | 12.86    | 0.18    | 0.18      | 0.2      | 0.3         | 0.4        | 0.8    | 1.2    | 1.6    | 2       | 6       |
| Effect (ha with improved seeds)      | 1000         | 6.431    | 0.091   | 0.09      | 0.1      | 0.15        | 0.2        | 0.4    | 0.6    | 0.8    | 1       | 3       |
| Programme costs                      |              | NPV      |         |           |          |             |            |        |        |        |         |         |
| Subsidty on seeds per ha             | USD          |          | 20.0    | 20.0      | 15.0     | 20.0        | 20.0       | 20.0   | 10.0   | 5.0    | -       | -       |
| Subsidy on seeds                     | M USD        | 0.0      | 0.0     | 0.0       | 0.0      | 0.0         | 0.0        | 0.0    | 0.0    | 0.0    | -       | -       |
| Introduction package                 | M USD        | 24.5     | 27.0    | -         | -        | -           | -          | -      | -      | -      | -       | -       |
| Awareness campaign                   | M USD        | 3.8      | 1.0     | 1.0       | 1.0      | 1.0         | 1.0        | -      | -      | -      | -       | -       |
| to be specified                      |              |          |         |           |          |             |            |        |        |        |         |         |
| Program administration               | M USD        | 2.7      | 0.5     | 0.5       | 0.5      | 0.5         | 0.5        | 0.5    | 0.5    | 0.5    | -       | -       |
| Total programme cost (NPV)           | <b>M USD</b> | 31.0     | 28.5    | 1.5       | 1.5      | 1.5         | 1.5        | 0.5    | 0.5    | 0.5    | -       | -       |
|                                      |              |          |         |           |          |             |            |        |        |        |         |         |
| Benefits                             | 1000         |          |         |           |          |             |            |        |        |        |         |         |
| Increased production                 | tonnes       | 76       | 1       | 1         | 1        | 2           | 2          | 5      | 7      | 9      | 12      | 36      |
| Cost vs. benefits                    |              |          |         |           |          |             |            |        |        |        |         |         |
| Programme costs/tonne of extra yield | 1            | 407      | USD/ton | ine Potat | Market p | orice for I | rish Pota  | to     |        | 300    | USD/tor | ine     |



(Source: adopted from Nygaard and Hansen, 2015)

# **ANNEX II: Economic Evaluation and Renewable Energy Input for Different Agriculture Adaptation Technologies**

#### A) Drip Irrigation Systems

**Technology Application:** Improved drip irrigation systems using rainwater harvesting and fertigation for crop nutrient requirement for five farmers groups plus training station at Central Farm

Climate change and climate variability are projected to significantly impact agricultural systems and practices such as soil fertility and land preparation, pest and disease control and water requirements (CCCCC, 2014). Increased stress on current livestock breeds and crop varieties is expected with higher ambient temperatures. Climate change and climate variability will also result in less rainfall overall. However, the most deleterious effect on agriculture will come from the variation of seasonal rainfall distribution, leading to more drought events and floods. "Dependent" rainfall for rain-fed agriculture systems during critical phases of crop development may not be received; therefore, farmers in Belize will have to adjust to the changes in rainfall pattern or expand the use of advance drip irrigation systems to ensure better yields and acceptable returns for their investments.

Improved drip irrigation systems and fertigation needs to satisfy crop water/nutrient requirements is an established technology for crop production in many countries. In generic terms, the benefits of irrigation are well known and can among others include: yield gap closure; multiple or prolonged cropping; access to niche markets; better crop quality; climate change adaptation; increased opportunities for import substitution and export; and justification for investment in added value (GOB/CDB/FAO, 2015).

Generally, lands that are irrigated have double yields compared to those without irrigation. For example, highland, mechanized, rain fed accounts for the majority of the total 1,800 acres of rice in the Toledo District of Belize. The average yield from such production ranges from 1,500 – 2,500 lbs./acre, while the mechanized, irrigated, low land produces upward of 5,000 lbs./acre (Chung, 2011). Also, crop quality, diversity and the ability to extend the growing season, especially for tropical climates, are some of the attributes of irrigated cropping systems. Because of irrigation, much of the world's undisturbed lands are spared the fate of agricultural expansion and development, and land use change (Chung, 2011).

The proposed improved irrigation technology intervention is intended to support the work of the Crop Research and Development Unit (CRDU) field station in Belmopan, five district agriculture training/demonstration sub-stations, and the Ministry of Agriculture training centre at Central Farm. The improved drip irrigation/rainwater harvesting & fertigation technology for training and demonstration will target small farmer's groups/cooperatives engaged in vegetable and horticulture cultivation under cover structure practiced by farmers in all six districts. Seven improved drip irrigation/water harvesting & fertigation technology transfer, and coordinated, managed and maintained by the CRDU and the Extension Service of the Ministry of Agriculture.

A tropical greenhouse is not to provide a warm and humid environment for crop, but to create an ideal condition in which plants can be protected against heavy rainfalls, direct solar radiation, disease, insects and birds. High relative humidity and ambient temperature microclimate in a tropical greenhouse creates a complicated dynamic system that is strongly influenced by changes of external conditions, making it a challenging environmental control task (Shamshin & Wan Ismael, 2013).

Protective cropping structures were introduced in Belize under the 9<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund (EDF) funded Agriculture Enterprise Development project (AED), and was well received by vegetable farmers. Some structures have been properly managed and some farmers have experimented with lower cost design structures (Salazar, 2013; Frutos, 2014).

As indicated, one main purpose of Protective Covered Structure (PCS) is to create a controlled environment for optimum growing conditions compared to growing outside in a non-controlled environment (FAO, 2011). A farmer or grower has many options in the design of the greenhouse structure and on how much control he/she may want or need for the crops that are being grown. Specifically, Protective Covered Structures (PCS) or Tropical Greenhouses contribute to increased productivity, improved produced quality, reduced cost of production, and reduce dependence on pesticides (Ramirez, 2010).

Protective Covered Structures in Belize are of four types, namely: Tropical Greenhouse, Bubble House, Bel Tunnel and Plastic Covered Structure (Ramirez, 2010; Reyes, 2010).

Improved PCS designs and systems may incorporate the following cooling technologies:

- Natural Passive Ventilation (Air exchange) and shading systems;
- Mechanical Active Ventilation powered with a small diesel generator;
- Mechanical Active Ventilation powered with solar energy;
- Evaporative Cooling: i) Evaporative cooling fan-pads, and ii) High pressure fogging.
- Earth-to-air heat exchange system.

*Natural Ventilation:* Natural ventilation allows the greenhouse structure to ventilate and cool by natural air movement within and outside the structure. The objective of natural ventilation is to maintain the same temperature inside the greenhouse as it is outside the greenhouse. This can be hard to accomplish because of influences by the solar heat gain through the covering, the type of covering used on the structure and directional placement of the structure on the land in relation to the prevailing winds (Parsons, 2015; FAO, 2011). In greenhouses with natural ventilation, internal and external shade systems can control the heat generated by the solar gain. Shade systems also help control the intensity of the light in the greenhouse, however one disadvantage with shading is the reduction of photo synthetically active radiation (PAR) required by crops (Kumar, et al, 2009). Based on the design of the naturally ventilated greenhouse, one can expect to see temperature difference ranging from near ambient to 10 degrees or more. Kumar et al (2009) indicated that the volume/floor ratio of greenhouse should be large as possible if local wind speed is not too high to maintain favourable environment for crop growth, recommending that combined sidewall vent area should be equal to the combined ridge vent area, and each should be at least 15 - 20 % of the floor area of the greenhouse for tropical conditions.

#### **C)** Crop Diversification and New Varieties

**Technology Application:** Heat and Drought Resistant varieties of open-pollinated corn and beans for seed and grain production among Small Farmers in Belize.

Climate variability and extreme events have been severely affecting Latin America over recent years (IPCC, 2007), and this trend will continue in the foreseeable future. Warmer temperatures, high rainfall variability, extended droughts and reduction in water supply will impact the agriculture sector in many regions of Central America, including Belize (CCCCC, 2014).

Yellow corn, white corn and black beans are staple grains in Belize. Reasonable production of these grains brings needed income for small farmers and contributes greatly to the community's food security. The Ministry of Agriculture/FAO and the Caribbean Agriculture Research and Development Institute (CARDI) have been involved in conducting programs to supply good quality seed and know-how to farmers that should generate higher yields and reduce the need for more land clearing for *milpa* farming or slash-and-burn.

The proposed technology transfer to produce *Heat and drought resistant variety of open-pollinated corn and black bean seeds for production and marketing among small farmers in Belize* through the Technology Needs Assessment project (UNEP/DTU, 2013) is an initiative being promoted by the Ministry of Agriculture to increase the capacity of four farming cooperatives and its Grain Production Unit at Central Farm. The objective is to expand the production of climate resilient quality corn and black bean seeds for supplying to small farmers, and a fourth farming cooperative to produce corn and black bean grain for the local market. The intervention will run for three years.

#### D) Crop Diversification and New Varieties Technology Application:

Establish an in-country Irish potato clean-stock production unit to produce quality seed-tuber planting material varieties better suited to Belize's current and future climate

The International Potato Centre (CIP, 2010) reported that potato is the third most important food crop in the world after rice and wheat. Potato is a major source of carbohydrate in the diet of hundreds of millions of people in developing countries. This includes the population of Belize. According to the International Potato Centre (2010), potato yields more nutritious food at a faster rate on less land and harsher climates than any other major crop. Short duration and wide flexibility in planting and harvesting time are other valuable traits that help adjusting the potato crop in various intensive-cropping systems without putting much pressure on scarce land and water resources (Naik and Karihaloo, 2007). Potato (*Solanum tuberosum L.*) belongs to the Solanaceae family of flowering plants. One hectare of potato can yield two to four times the food quantity of grain crops. Hence, potato is a critical crop in the response to population growth and increased hunger rate around the world and in Belize.

While potato forms an important component of the Belizean diet the varieties grown in the country are more suited to temperate conditions and so production is restricted to a few areas of the country which have the cooler climates suitable for potato production. Because of these restrictions, national production not always sufficient to meet local market requirements and at certain times of year potato must be imported into the country.

Because the varieties currently grown are temperate types, climate warming will create problems in the future if quality planting material, of heat tolerant varieties, is not made available to farmers. Without such an intervention, the medium and long-term sustainability of potato production in Belize will be under threat which, in turn, will negatively impact Belize's food security.

As potatoes are reproduced vegetative (they are propagated from cuttings) they are more likely to become infected with pests and diseases (especially viruses) transmitted from generation to generation than are seed propagated crops (CGIAR, 2012). Consequently, potato production plots need to be planted each year with fresh "clean" material (i.e. that has been tested free of specified diseases). Belize's annual requirement for such "clean" seed-tubers is currently imported each year, at some expense, from the USA. There is a need for Belize to establish its own national capacity to produce potato seed-tubers. Shortage of good quality seed is the single most important factor limiting potato production in developing countries. This project will address these issues by establishing a national Irish potato clean-stock production unit that will produce high quality seed-tubers (free of specified diseases) for planting by small-scale farmers. The varieties produced will be better adapted to tropical farming conditions and so, in the short-term, enhance the capacity of Belizean farmers to expand current production into areas where, and months when, potato is not currently grown and, in the medium and longer-term, increase potato farming's resilience to climate warming.

Potato is currently produced by small-scale farmers in San Antonio, Upper and Lower Barton Creek, Springfield village, La Gracia, and El Progresso of the Cayo District. As potato varieties used require cool conditions for tuber production and these farming communities have the required conditions for growing the varieties currently available in the country during the cool period of November to February. The Red la Roche and Red la Soda potato varieties are the varieties mostly planted in Belize.

According to Belize Ministry of Agriculture in 2012 Belize planted 112 hectares of Irish potato, producing 3 million pounds with a yield of 26,910 lb./ha, ranking 110 in the world in terms of yield. While in 2015, Irish potato production in Belize was 2.24 million pounds and the yield were 25,869 lb./ha. In a January 2018 Press Release by the MOA, it was announced that total estimated potato production for the 2017-18 cropping season was 3.7 million pounds, with potato cultivation spreading to the northern Corozal District and southern Stann Creek District.

#### **Economic Evaluation**

#### E1) Drip Irrigation Systems

Technology Application: Improved drip irrigation systems using rainwater harvesting and fertigation for crop nutrient requirement for five farmers groups plus a training centre at Central Farm

All prices are in USD

| Capital Investment Cost | Six only improved drip irrigation system with irrigation and |
|-------------------------|--|
|                         | water abstraction facility to irrigate 6 acres:              |

|                |            | @ US\$ 7,000.00 e  | ach                                      |
|----------------|------------|--------------------|--|
|                | Cost       |                    | US\$ 42,000.00                           |
|                | Six pump   | s @ US\$ 1,200.00  |  |
|                | 3,000.00   | solar)             |  |
|                | Cost       |                    | US \$7,200.00 ( <mark>18,000.00</mark> ) |
|                | Six wells  | @ US\$ 7,000.00    |  |
|                | Cost       |                    | US\$ 42,000.00                           |
|                | Six 2,000  | gallons Water Ta   | nks                                      |
|                |            | @ US\$ 800.00      |  |
|                | Cost       |                    | US\$ 4,800.00                            |
|                | Training e | extension personne | l and four farmers groups                |
|                |            | @ US\$ 5,000.00    |  |
|                | Cost       |                    | US\$ 20,000.00                           |
|                |            |                    |  |
|                | Total Cos  | st                 | US\$ 116,000.00 ( <mark>126,800)</mark>  |
| Operating Cost | Spares an  | d maintenance per  | year US\$15,000.00                       |
|                | Total Cos  | st                 | US\$ 45,000.00                           |





#### Annex-II E2: Market Mapping for improved drip irrigation and fertigation



(Source: After Nygaard and Hansen, 2015)

#### Market Mapping for transfer and diffusion of improved drip irrigation and fertigation system

#### Summary, barriers and gaps

Reference Market mapping schematic for improved drip irrigation

- i. *Exporters/manufacturers of drip irrigation system & components/spares:* Procured from foreign manufacturers/outlets etc. by local importers & retailers of agro-technology equipment. Funds for procurement of irrigation equipment and components from importers/retailers will come from capital costs. Farmers may purchase from importers. Retailers, or if they preferred, directly from the manufacturer/franchise.
- ii. *Import duties/taxes and subsidies:* Taxes may apply, but subsidies may be granted to importers which can be passed down to the farmers and institutions at the other end of the market chain.
- iii. Importers and Retailers: Equipment and spares for irrigation, fertigation, cover structures, nurseries, harvesting, cool storage facilities, solar-powered water pumps, and water tanks shall be imported from manufacturers or their outlets, and stocks will be made available for retailers and clients. Import taxes are mostly zero rated for irrigation and solar PV systems, but taxes may apply for certain components such as inverters, batteries, pvc pipes/fittings, and material to manufacture water tanks, etc.
- *Input and Service Providers:* Inputs for crop protection, fertilizers, etc., and Service Providers for RE system installation (i.e. Solar PV, dryers, and cold storage facilities for grains) are available. The Research and Development Unit provides service and training for installing drip irrigation systems. Technology information and demonstration are made available to famers, but there is more to be done for expanded dissemination of relevant information and training of new technologies. Also, information and training in market principles and basic economics is limited, as is the need to utilize social media as a form for networking among producers, service providers/assemblers and importers. Another limitation or barrier is the limited level of education of many small and medium-scale farmers. Language barriers also exist in some instances.
- v. Enabling Business Environment: MOA and partners (CARDI, BELTRAIDE, IICA, DFC and others) are available to provide guidance and advise to farmers on issues related to affordable loans, other financing opportunities, market fluctuations and opportunities, and policy changes. The gap here seems to be limited networking among main actors. The leadership role here is the MOA, whose Extension Service and Policy Unit are closest to farmer's interests. The Extension Service plays a crucial role and must be empowered (through training, increased capacity and public relations guidance) to continue the good work of improving production and climate smart agriculture among the small and medium scale farmers. On their own, most small famers, and to a lesser extent, medium-scale farmers, do not have the capital to invest on a medium-size (5 10 acres) irrigation system. Large farmers impact the environment to a greater extent, A gap exist here that requires the joint cooperation of key actors in the Sector to address with sustainable development programmes and outreach.
- vi. Policies and medium-term strategies must be updated and adopted to respond to the advances in technologies and changing market conditions, that if properly managed and use, can significantly improve yields of high quality, competitive products, with minimal impacts on the environment.
- vii. Training at specific links of the drip irrigation market change (e.g. Service Providers, MOA CRDU, Extension Service and at the Farm level) is paramount for successful operation. Farmer's outreach programme and MOA's Public Relations activities have room for improvement and expansion..
   Funds for capacity building and networking should be allocated from the operational budget.

- viii. Another gap identified is an Agriculture Testing/Certification Centre that can certify the quality of equipment, spares, inputs, seeds etc. The status of testing or certification is mainly for Phytosanitary, biosafety and risk analysis for import/export of organisms/products through BAHA, while the Pesticides Control Board is responsible for the safe use and control of pesticides.
  - ix. The economic and technical capacity of many small farmers to procure and operate an improved drip/fertigation irrigation system is generally limited. Medium-scale farmers would be the favoured target group in the market chain for this technology diffusion (L. Gladden, Chief, NCO, personal comm. Mar. 2018).
  - x. The Policy and Strategy for drainage and irrigation should be reviewed and implemented. The issue of integrated water resource management and irrigation becomes crucial, as the stress on this vital resource increases as a result of anthropogenic impacts in the watersheds, coupled with the increasing negative impacts of climate change on the rainfall regime. Spearheading this initiative should be the Water Management and Climate Change Unit of the Ministry of Agriculture.

#### F) Crop Diversification and New Varieties

#### Technology Application: Refurbishment of Seven Protective Structure Cooling Systems

| Capital Investment Cost | Refurbishment of 1-unit Tropical Greenhouse with<br>dimensions: 54' x 82' x 23'; Volume: 101,844 ft <sup>3</sup><br>1) Redesigning natural ventilations: |
|-------------------------|--|
|                         | US\$ 2,000.00<br>2) Ceiling Shading  |
|                         | US\$ 3,000.00<br>3) Refurbishing one Tropical Greenhouse: Unit cost is<br>US\$ 20,000.00   |
|                         | Total for 1 UnitUS\$ 20,000.00Sub Total:US\$ 25,000.00Refurbishment of 7 typical unit Bel Tunnel with<br>dimensions:14' x 60' x 12'; Volume: 10,080 ft³  |
|                         | 2) Redesigning natural ventilations:   |
|                         | US\$ 1,000.00<br>3) Ceiling Shading  |
|                         | US\$ 1,500.00<br>4) Unit cost US\$10,000.00  |
|                         | Total for Seven (7) Units (one in each of the six districts plus<br>Belmopan)  |
|                         | <b>Total cost US\$ 70,000.00</b><br>5) Training of 6 Technicians in six districts  |
|                         | Cost @ US\$ 2,000.00 per training<br>Total cost US\$ 12,000.00   |
|                         | Overall Total cost US\$ 109,500.00   |
| Operating Cost          | Monitoring and evaluation: US\$ 6,000.00 per year for three<br>(3) years = US\$ 18,000.00  |

| Cost of Spares and material: US\$10,000.00                 |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Total  | US\$ 28,000.00                          |  |  |  |
| One Renewable technology provider has the following 5-year |   |  |  |  |
| de-rated warranty offer:                                   |   |  |  |  |
| Year 1: 100 % cover 1                                      | for equipment                           |  |  |  |
| Year 2: Units get repaired or replaced at 50 % discount    |   |  |  |  |
| Year 3: Units get repa                                     | aired or replaced at 25 % discount etc. |  |  |  |

#### Tropical Greenhouse with dimensions: 54' x 82' x 23'; Volume: 101,844 ft<sup>3</sup>

NPV: 43,604.00 US\$ IRR: 51.7 %

#### YOUR OPERATING CASH FLOW, FREE CASH FLOW, & CASH LIQUIDITY



| YEAR                   | 1        | 2        | 3        |
|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| OPERATING CASH FLOW    | \$21,934 | \$21,934 | \$21,934 |
| FREE CASH FLOW         | -\$66    | \$21,934 | \$21,934 |
| CASH LIQUIDITY BALANCE | -\$66    | \$21,868 | \$43,802 |

#### Bel Tunnel with dimensions: 14' x 60' x 12'; Volume: 10,080 ft<sup>3</sup>

NPV:-42,280.900 IRR: -176.6 %



| YEAR                   | 1         | 2        | 3        |
|------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| OPERATING CASH FLOW    | \$2,620   | \$2,620  | \$2,620  |
| FREE CASH FLOW         | -\$11,880 | \$2,620  | \$2,620  |
| CASH LIQUIDITY BALANCE | -\$11,880 | -\$9,260 | -\$6,640 |

#### **G)** Crop Diversification and New Varieties

Technology Application: Heat and Drought Resistant varieties of open-pollinated corn and beans for seed and grain production among Small Farmers in Belize.

| Capital Investment Cost | Crop establishment input:                |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|                         | Initial cost: seed acquisition and       | Initial cost: seed acquisition and importation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | US \$ 4,000.00                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Infrastructure for the three             | (3) Quality Seed producing                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Cooperatives & Grain Unit (CF)           | each cultivating 6 acres                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Irrigation systems (3 Units)             | US\$14,000.00 (18,000.00)                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Wells 3                                  | US\$11,000.00 (21,000.00)                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Pumps 3                                  | US\$1,800.00 (21,000.00 solar)                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Sub Total 1 U                            | JS\$30,800.00                                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Harvesting and shelling cost:            | US\$3,000.00                                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Post-Harvest Costs:                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Storage for Cooperatives                 | US\$12,000.00                                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Seed Cold Storage (CF Group)             | US\$15,000.00 <mark>(17,000 solar</mark>       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | A/C)                                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Marketing:                               | US\$4,000.00                                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Sub Total 2                              | US\$34,000.00                                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | San Carlos New River Farmers Cooperative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | (Grain production & Marketing            |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | Irrigation system (1 Center pivo         | ot Unit, 25 acres)                             |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         |  | US\$40,000.00 (15,000 Solar                    |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|                  | pump)                            |                                      |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|                  | Land Preparation (25 acres)      | US\$7,500.00                         |
|                  |                                  |                                      |
|                  | Crop establishment Input:        |                                      |
|                  | Initial cost: seed acquisition a | nd importation (25 acres) &          |
|                  | fertilizer                       |                                      |
|                  |                                  | US\$4,000.00                         |
|                  | Harvesting and shelling cost:    | US\$3,000.00                         |
|                  | Post Harvest Costs               |                                      |
|                  | Storage:                         | US\$1,500.00                         |
|                  | Marketing:                       | US\$3,000.00                         |
|                  | Training (4 Groups Farmers)      | US\$20,000.00                        |
|                  | Sub Total 3                      | US\$79,000.00                        |
|                  | Collection and Maintenance of    | f seed Germplasm (CARDI)             |
|                  | Sub Total 4                      | US\$10,000.00                        |
|                  | Grand Total                      | US\$153,800.00                       |
| Operating        | Seed selection and production    | n to maintain integrity for at least |
| Cost/Maintenance | six cultivation seasons (3 year  | s, Crop Section MOA, Crop Unit)      |
|                  | US\$500.00 per acre              |                                      |
|                  | Cost US\$9,0                     | 000.00 for 6 acres for 3 years       |
|                  | Storage & cooling system (S      | solar power, four pumps for drip     |
|                  | irrigation) US\$8,0              | 00.00                                |
|                  | Maintenance for Sprinkler Irr    | igation system (Research Unit CF     |
|                  | technicians, 3 years, @ US\$2,0  | )00.00/year)                         |
|                  | US\$6,0                          | 00.00                                |
|                  | Total Operating Costs US\$2      | 3,000.00                             |

H1) Crop Diversification and New Varieties

Technology Application:

Establish an in-country Irish potato clean-stock production unit to produce quality seed-tuber planting material varieties better suited to Belize's current and future climate

| Capital Investment Cost | Potato seed-tuber expert 2-week working visit to Belize to develop full project document. Cost: US\$12,000.00  |
|-------------------------|--|
|                         | The initial cost of new varieties of seed tubers imported into<br>Belize plus UB micro-propagation lab services and nursery<br>infrastructure development will be in the order of US\$<br>100,000. |

|                     | Construction of tuberization screenhouses with irrigation and cooling systems US\$ 100,000.  |
|---------------------|--|
|                     | Construction of cool temperature-controlled potato storage facilities in three locations – US\$ 100,000  |
|                     | BAHA cost for phytosanitary services will run in the order of US\$ 5,000 for initial importation of seed tubers and travel of BAHA staff to conduct evaluation in source country.  |
|                     | Through BELTRADE fiscal incentives for agro-business and processing, the climate resilient Irish potato seed tuber shipment will be imported with custom duty exceptions US\$ 20,000.  |
|                     | Total Capital Cost: US \$337,000   |
| Operating Cost      | Establishment of farmer field trials to evaluate varieties – US\$ 25,000.  |
|                     | Approximate cost of seed-tuber production in screen-house<br>or tropical green house by Ministry of Agriculture and farmer<br>groups - US\$ 50,000 per year, for the five years of the<br>proposed project cycle – Total US\$ 250,000. |
|                     | Initial costs for farmer acquisition, cultivation, harvesting and storage of crops for two seasons – US\$ 200,000.   |
|                     | Training programs and consultancy visits – US\$ 100,000.   |
|                     | Establishment of standards and certification system – US\$<br>50,000   |
|                     | Total operating costs = US\$ 625,000   |
| Total Project Costs | US\$ 962,000   |

#### Market Mapping for transfer and diffusion of clean, certified seed tuber Potato varieties

#### Summary, barriers and gaps

Reference Market mapping schematic for micro-propagation of clean, climate resilient, certified Irish potato seed-tubers in Annex II H2.

- i. *Source Basic Seeds (Clean parent material):* Procured from potato breeding centres in the United States and/or the International Potato Centre in Peru (CIP). Private sector importers, GOB through MOA/UB, CARDI, others.
- ii. *Import duties/taxes and subsidies:* Taxes may apply, but subsidies may be granted to importers which can be passed down to the farmers at the other end of the market chain.
- iii. *UB micro-propagation laboratory:* Equipment and material will have to be procured in the capital cost for up-grading laboratory facilities, and fund must be available for first 2.5 years of operation and maintenance. Funds for expert consultant for developing production strategic workplan and guidelines for micro-propagation of 'Source Basic Seeds'' to certified potato seed tubers for farmers,

must be part of the capital costs. Training of micro-propagation laboratory technicians and field workers, and farmer's outreach programme and technology awareness/education campaign, should be funded from capital cost.

- iv. *Importers and Retailers:* Equipment and spares for irrigation, fertigation, cover structures, nursery, and water pumping/harvesting and storage, shall be imported, and stocks available. Import taxes are mostly zero rated for irrigation and solar PV systems, but taxes are applied for certain components such as inverters, batteries, and miscellaneous spares.
- v. *Input and Service Providers:* Generally available. Gaps exist in provision of information on technology and the changing market, and also networking among producers and service providers and importers.
- vi. *Enabling Business Environment:* MOA and partners (CARDI, BELTRAIDE, IICA, DFC and others) are available to provide guidance and advise to farmers on issues related to affordable loans, other finance opportunities, the market, and policy changes. The gap here seems to be limited networking among main actors, the leadership role here is the MOA, whose extension service and policy office is closest to farmers. The Extension Service plays a crucial role and must be empowered (through training, increased capacity and public relations) to continue the good work of improving production among the small and medium scale farmers.
- vii. The micro-propagation of climate resilient, Source Basic Seeds of Irish Potato is envisioned to become sustainable and profitable in the medium term as potato production increases, and market opportunities are secured.

# Annex-II H2: Market Mapping for micro-propagation of clean, climate resilient, certified Irish potato seed tubers



(Source: After Nygaard and Hansen, 2015)

# I) Irish Potato Clean-stock Seed-tuber Micro-propagation

(Source: UB Plant Micro-Propagation Laboratory, May, 2017)

| Irish Potato Clean-Stock Seed-Tuber Production System |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Month   | Activity   | Description   | Institution / persons responsible  |  |  |  |  |
| 0-3   | Source Basic Seed<br>Source "clean" parent<br>material | Indexed (tested to be free of specified disease) potato tubers sprouted   | Ministry of Agriculture /<br>University of Belize /<br>Belize Agricultural<br>Health Authority |  |  |  |  |
| 0-8   | Create Basic Seed                                      | If basic seed cannot be sourced<br>production of virus-free potato plants<br>(basic seed) using meristem culture / heat<br>treatment. Process takes 4-8 months. | University of Belize<br>micropropagation lab   |  |  |  |  |

| 8-20<br>(12<br>months) | <u>Shoot-tip</u><br>multiplication   | Shoot tips introduced into tissue culture<br>media (Murashige and Skoog without<br>cytokinin) to produce large numbers of<br>micro-cuttings. This sub-culturing is a<br>continuous process. |   |
|------------------------|--|---|---|
| 21-22<br>(2 months)    | Micro-tuberization   | Cuttings placed in cultures with high<br>sucrose media in dark at or <sup>c</sup> to induce<br>tuberization. Process takes two months.  |   |
| 23-26<br>(4 months)    | Micro-tuber storage  | Micro-tubers held in dry jars<br>at 5-6 °C for 3-4 months to break<br>dormancy  |   |
| 27-30<br>(4 months)    | Micro-tuber<br>germination to<br>produce <u>mini-tubers</u>                    | Plant micro-tubers in screenhouses in November to produce mini-tubers.  |   |
| 31-38<br>(8 months)    | Mini-tuber storage   | Mini-tubers stored at 10 °C for 8 months.   | Ministry of Agriculture                             |
| 39-42<br>(4 months)    | Mini-tuber<br>germination<br>to produce <u>certified</u><br><u>seed-tubers</u> | Mini-tubers planted in farmer screen-<br>houses in November to produce seed<br>tubers.  | Farmers – facilitated by<br>Ministry of Agriculture |
| 42-49<br>(8 months)    | <u>Certified seed-tuber</u><br><u>storage</u>                                  | Seed tubers stored at 10 °C for 8 months.   | Ministry of Agriculture                             |
| 50                     | Field planting with<br>quality <u>certified seed-</u><br><u>tubers</u>         | In November / Dec seed tubers<br>distributed to farmers for field planting.   | Seed-tubers distributed to farmers by Min Agric.    |
| 54                     | Potato harvest   | In February / March potatoes are harvested and delivered to market.   | Farmers   |

#### Summary

#### I) Drip Irrigation Systems

Technology Application: Improved drip irrigation systems using rainwater harvesting and fertigation for crop nutrient requirement for five farmers groups plus training station at Central Farm.

Feasibility of the implementation of the proposed improved irrigation technology intervention was calculated on the basis of tomato plants. Implementation of an improved irrigation system is economically feasible as it increases the yield by approx. 40 percent.

The commonly used water pumps fuelled with gasoline or diesel shall be exchanged with solar water pumps. Six solar pumps for 6 units of 1 acre each.

#### J) Crop Diversification and New Variety

Technology Application: Refurbishment of Seven Protective Structure Cooling Systems

Natural ventilation allows the greenhouse structure to ventilate and cool by natural air movement within and outside the structure. One Tropical Greenhouse shall receive 18 solar fans (9 intake and exhaust fans and 9 ceiling fans). The Tropical Greenhouse is already feasible on its own and is more feasible with ventilation.

The seven Bel Tunnels are economically feasible without fans. The investment costs of 9 solar fans (6 intake and exhaust fans, 3 ceiling fans), are very high considering the income that the farmers can create in these small units. To make the Bel Tunnel project more feasible ventilation needs to be reduced.

K) Crop Diversification and New Varieties

Technology Application: Heat and Drought Resistant varieties of open-pollinated corn and beans for seed and grain production among Small Farmers in Belize.

The commonly used water pumps fuelled with gasoline or diesel shall be exchanged with solar water pumps, 3 solar pumps for 3 units 6 acres each, one solar pump for 25 acres.

3 solar A/C each 18,000 BTU to replace the very inefficient cooling system at the storage house in central farm.

Energy saving up to 85 % or 29,000 kWh or 11,680 BZD per year

L) Crop Diversification and New Varieties

Technology Application:

Establish an in-country Irish potato clean-stock production unit to produce certified seed-tuber planting material varieties better suited to Belize's current and future climate

4 Solar-powered air conditioning units to replace inefficient units at the laboratory on the UB compound at Central Farm.

3 Solar cooling and irrigation systems with solar pumps and solar fans for Screen houses.

9 Solar-powered air conditioning units for 3 storage structures.

# ANNEX III: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED AND THEIR CONTACTS

List of Key Stakeholders for TNA-Belize. BA & EF for Agriculture, Water and Coastal & Marine Ecosystem Sectors: ADAPTATION Technology

**Venue:** Ministry of Agriculture Research and Development Unit, Central Farm, Cayo District

Date: Dec. 6, 2016

| Sector      | Nama         | Institution  |          | Contact Information                |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|----------|------------------------------------|
| Sector      | Ivaille      | Institution  | Contact  | Email Address                      |
|             |              |              |          |                                    |
|             | Hector Reyes | CARDI        | 824-2934 | <u>cardi@btl.net</u>               |
|             | Omira Avila  | CARDI        | 608-1325 | oavila@cardi.org                   |
|             | Manuel       | MNRA         | 650-0961 | manuel.trujillo@agriculture.gov.bz |
| AUNICULIUNE | Trujillo     | Central Farm |          |                                    |
|             | Andrew       | MNRA         | 828-5095 | andrew.harrison@agriculture.gov.bz |
|             | Harrison     |              |          |                                    |
|             |              |              |          |                                    |

|       | John Carr           | Banana Bank              | 832-2020 | <u>bbl@bananabank.com</u>           |
|-------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|
|       |                     | Agriculture              |          |                                     |
|       | Hugo                | Belize Water             | 634-1440 | hugo.rancharan@bwsl.com.bz          |
|       | Rancharan           | Services Limited         |          |                                     |
|       | Keisha              | BMDP/MNRA                | 615-3420 | pp.urbanplanner@mnra.gov.bz         |
|       | Rodriguez           |                          |          |                                     |
|       |                     |                          |          |                                     |
|       | Raul                | Belize                   | 610-2740 | <u>raul.villanueva@bel.com.bz</u>   |
|       | Villanueva          | Electricity Ltd.         |          |                                     |
|       | Yvette              | IICA                     | 822-0222 | <u>yvette.alonzo@iica.int</u>       |
|       | Alonzo              |                          |          |                                     |
|       | Francis Arzu        | Lands & Survey           | 615-4572 | <u>plio@mnra.gov.bz</u>             |
|       | W'III' O            | Dept                     | (02 20(0 |                                     |
|       | William Can         | Ministry of              | 602-2068 | jcan@agriculture.gov.bz             |
|       |                     | Agriculture,             |          | jonathancan_60@yanoo.com            |
|       | Disarda             | Extension<br>Ministry of | (21 5(29 | ricondo thomas an Ocericalture con  |
|       | Ricardo<br>Thompson | Ministry of              | 031-3028 | hz                                  |
|       | Thompson            | Agriculture              |          | <u>0Z</u>                           |
|       | Stephen             | University of            | 610-2737 | swilliam@ub.edu.bz                  |
|       | Williame            | Belize Plant             | 010-2757 | <u>Swithante ub.cdu.uz</u>          |
|       | vv minamis          | Propagation Lab          |          |                                     |
|       | David Guerra        | University of            | 615-6677 | douerra@ub.edu.bz                   |
|       | David Odella        | Belize Plant             | 015-0077 | <u>uguena e ub.euu.bz</u>           |
|       |                     | Propagation              |          |                                     |
|       |                     | Laboratory               |          |                                     |
|       | Jesse Madrid        | Ministry of              | 668-1437 | Madridiess88@vahoo.com              |
|       | besse maana         | Agriculture              | 000 1107 | <u></u>                             |
|       | Gary Ramirez        | Ministry of              | 634-3929 | gramirez@agriculture.gov.bz         |
|       |                     | Agriculture,             |          | <u>e</u>                            |
|       |                     | Research and             |          |                                     |
|       |                     | Development              |          |                                     |
|       |                     | Unit (RDU)               |          |                                     |
|       | Christobal          | Ministry of              | 634-9590 | Christobal.teck@agriculture.gov.bz  |
|       | Teck                | Agriculture              |          |                                     |
|       | Clifford            | DAC Ministry of          | 629-8088 | Clifford.martinez@agricultutre.gov. |
|       | Martinez            | Agriculture              |          | <u>bz</u>                           |
|       |                     |                          |          |                                     |
|       | Oscar Salazar       | RDU, Ministry            | 804-2079 | okisalazar@yahoo.com                |
|       |                     | of Agriculture           | 804-2129 |                                     |
|       |                     |                          |          |                                     |
|       | Dale 1              | Dell's Dell's            | 651 2505 |                                     |
|       | Roland              | Commission               | 031-3393 | <u>mvers@puc.bz</u>                 |
|       | Wayna Cadla         | Belizo                   | 610 0844 | wayna cadla@bacal.com.br            |
|       | wayne Caule         | Flectricity              | 010-0644 | wayne.caue@becor.con.bz             |
|       |                     | Company L td             |          |                                     |
|       |                     | (BECOL)                  |          |                                     |
|       | Edilberto           | Programme for            | 227-5616 | execdirector@pfbelize.org           |
| WATER | Romero              | Belize                   | 227 3010 |                                     |
|       | Ernest Banner       | Rural                    | 822-0073 | ernest.banner@gmail.com             |
|       |                     | Development              |          | coord.rural.dev@labour.gov.bz       |
|       | Tennielle           | MNRA                     |          | Policy.publicliaison@mnra.gov.bz    |
|       | Williams            | Hydrology                |          |                                     |
|       | John Bodden         | Public Health,           | 670-4378 | jbodden@health.gov.bz               |
|       |                     | MOH                      |          |                                     |
|       | Anthony             | Public Health            | 223-1213 | aflowers@health.gov.bz              |
|       | Flowers             | Water Quality            |          |                                     |

|                 |                            | Lab              |          |                                    |
|-----------------|----------------------------|------------------|----------|------------------------------------|
|                 | Cecy Castillo              | University of    | 625-6271 | cacastillo@ub.edu.bz               |
|                 |                            | Belize           |          | <pre>cecycas_bz@yahoo.com</pre>    |
|                 |                            |                  |          |                                    |
| COASTAL &       | Darlene                    | MAFFESD          | 828-4794 | sn.susdevofficer@ffsd.gov.bz       |
| MARINE          | Padron                     |                  |          |                                    |
| ECOSYSTEM       | Vivian                     | Fisheries        | 224-4552 | <u>vr.ppv@ffsd.gov.bz</u>          |
|                 | Belisle-                   | Department       |          | vivian@fishries.gov.bz             |
|                 | Ramnarace                  |                  |          |                                    |
|                 | Eugene                     | MAFFESD –        | 626-1053 | <u>kba.po@ffsd.gov.bz</u>          |
|                 | Waight                     | KBA              |          |                                    |
|                 | James Azueta               | Fisheries        | 620-2383 | Jamesazueta_bz@yahoo.com           |
|                 |                            | Department       |          |                                    |
|                 | Samir Rosado               | Coastal Zone     | 223-0719 | coastalplanner@coastalzonebelize.o |
|                 |                            | CZMA             |          | rg                                 |
|                 |                            |                  |          |                                    |
|                 | Stacey                     | Coastal Zone     | 223-0719 | gistechnician@coastalzonebelize.or |
|                 | Cayetano                   | CZMAI            |          | g                                  |
|                 | John Reyes                 | Ministry of      | 227-2801 | John.reyes@tourism.gov.bz          |
|                 |                            | Tourism, Culture |          |                                    |
|                 |                            | and Civil        |          |                                    |
|                 |                            | Aviation         | 004 0401 |                                    |
|                 | G. Rosado                  | NPAS - MFFSD     | 824-0401 | <u>Co.npas@ffsd.gov.bz</u>         |
|                 |                            |                  | 000 0707 |                                    |
|                 | Nicole Zetina              | BELIKAIDE        | 822-3737 | nicolezetina@gmail.com             |
|                 | <b>A</b>                   | Office of the    | 610 2172 |                                    |
|                 | Amparo                     | Drime Minister   | 010-2172 | amparo.masson@opm.gov.bz           |
| EINANCE &       | Iviasson<br>Lionno Torrego |                  | 012 2727 | lianna@halizainwaat ang hz         |
|                 | Cormon Silvo               | DELIKAIDE        | 822-3737 | <u>ilaine@bellZellivest.org.bz</u> |
| SECTOR          | Carmen Silva               | U.S. Ellibassy   | 022-4011 | sirviac@state.gov                  |
| (Cross Cutting) | Marco Valla                | DroSolar         | Q22 2217 | marco@prosolartd.com               |
| (Cross Cutting) | Marco valle,               | riosolar         | 032-221/ | marcowprosorantu.com               |
|                 | Manager                    |                  |          |                                    |
|                 | Ramón Frutos               | Lead Consultant  | 630 9724 | ecosolrf@gmail.com;                |
|                 |                            |                  |          | rfrutos01@yahoo.com                |

# **ANNEX IV: Gross Domestic Product by Activity**

 Table A-4.1 GDP 2002-2012 p by Activity – Current prices (Source: SIB, 2015)

| Gross Domestic Product by Activity<br>Constant Prices - BZ\$ Million |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Industry   | 2002    | 2003    | 2004    | 2005    | 2006    | 2007    | 2008    | 2009    | 2010r   | 2011r   | 2012p   |
| Agriculture and forestry   | 183.9   | 212.1   | 237.2   | 235.4   | 233.4   | 230.4   | 222.4   | 210.2   | 237.9   | 226.6   | 249.8   |
| Growing of crops: horticulture                                       | 136.4   | 163.8   | 184.3   | 181.0   | 186.5   | 180.8   | 173.2   | 162.9   | 193.7   | 177.7   | 202.0   |
| Livestock farming  | 36.7    | 38.1    | 41.9    | 42.1    | 34.6    | 37.1    | 36.5    | 37.1    | 38.4    | 43.0    | 42.6    |
| Forestry and logging   | 10.8    | 10.2    | 11.0    | 12.3    | 12.3    | 12.5    | 12.7    | 10.2    | 5.8     | 5.9     | 5.3     |
| Fishing  | 60.3    | 126.8   | 133.8   | 147.2   | 124.4   | 53.5    | 89.6    | 109.5   | 103.7   | 100.2   | 99.3    |
| Mining and guarrying   | 8.8     | 8.8     | 9.3     | 8.7     | 9.0     | 10.4    | 12.4    | 11.0    | 11.5    | 11.9    | 13.0    |
| Primary Industries   | 252.9   | 347.8   | 380.3   | 391.3   | 366.9   | 294.3   | 324.4   | 330.7   | 353.2   | 338.7   | 362.1   |
| Manufacturing  | 160.9   | 160.4   | 180.3   | 181.1   | 236.2   | 243.9   | 254.5   | 326.0   | 299.3   | 291.6   | 269.5   |
| Manuf. of food products and beverages                                | 121.0   | 120.3   | 134.4   | 136.0   | 127.3   | 118.9   | 124.9   | 126.2   | 118.1   | 121.1   | 139.6   |
| Man. of textiles, clothing and footwear                              | 17.7    | 18.0    | 22.1    | 19.6    | 20.2    | 9.6     | 0.2     | 0.0     | 0.0     | 0.0     | 0.0     |
| Other manufacturing (incl. petroleum)                                | 22.2    | 22.2    | 23.8    | 25.4    | 88.7    | 115.4   | 129.5   | 199.8   | 181.2   | 170.5   | 129.9   |
| Electricity and water supply   | 60.2    | 65.3    | 64.3    | 64.0    | 90.4    | 92.5    | 96.3    | 106.1   | 128.9   | 124.4   | 115.8   |
| Construction   | 87.0    | 71.5    | 74.7    | 72.0    | 70.6    | 68.4    | 79.0    | 71.1    | 53.5    | 52.1    | 60.0    |
| Secondary Industries   | 308.2   | 297.2   | 319.3   | 317.0   | 397.2   | 404.8   | 429.9   | 503.2   | 481.8   | 468.1   | 445.2   |
| Wholesale and retail trade, repairs                                  | 302.4   | 306.6   | 306.6   | 322.7   | 326.8   | 332.8   | 347.1   | 323.9   | 357.7   | 381.9   | 402.0   |
| Hotels and restaurants   | 68.0    | 77.9    | 84.4    | 88.1    | 87.5    | 91.4    | 87.2    | 78.1    | 81.0    | 82.4    | 91.5    |
| Transport, and communication   | 176.4   | 191.5   | 201.1   | 218.8   | 226.4   | 258.2   | 248.1   | 245.0   | 256.7   | 260.2   | 273.4   |
| Transport and storage  | 72.4    | 73.5    | 81.3    | 80.4    | 78.3    | 81.4    | 79.7    | 71.1    | 76.6    | 74.9    | 78.0    |
| Post and telecommunications  | 104.0   | 118.0   | 119.7   | 138.5   | 148.2   | 176.8   | 168.4   | 173.9   | 180.1   | 185.3   | 195.5   |
| Financial intermediation   | 131.1   | 172.4   | 181.8   | 179.6   | 194.5   | 219.4   | 223.4   | 273.6   | 285.7   | 281.1   | 273.1   |
| Real estate, renting and business services                           | 121.7   | 123.1   | 130.0   | 143.0   | 154.8   | 157.4   | 160.1   | 147.9   | 146.2   | 149.8   | 157.6   |
| Community, social and personal services                              | 106.2   | 111.5   | 115.3   | 120.6   | 124.2   | 128.3   | 130.3   | 130.8   | 132.7   | 135.8   | 139.3   |
| General government services  | 181.2   | 192.7   | 195.3   | 197.8   | 189.2   | 197.3   | 206.8   | 221.2   | 222.5   | 220.5   | 234.6   |
| Tertiary Industries  | 1,087.0 | 1,175.7 | 1,214.5 | 1,270.7 | 1,303.4 | 1,384.8 | 1,403.0 | 1,420.5 | 1,482.5 | 1,511.8 | 1,571.6 |
| Less: Financial services indirectly measured                         | 73.4    | 97.3    | 101.3   | 99.7    | 109.3   | 129.0   | 126.6   | 151.0   | 166.6   | 152.0   | 142.8   |
| All Industries at Basic Prices                                       | 1,574.7 | 1,723.4 | 1,812.7 | 1,879.2 | 1,958.1 | 1,955.0 | 2,030.6 | 2,103.4 | 2,150.8 | 2,166.6 | 2,236.2 |
| Taxes less subsidies on products                                     | 262.4   | 285.1   | 289.1   | 285.0   | 307.8   | 338.3   | 351.0   | 285.3   | 311.5   | 347.4   | 378.7   |
| GDP at Market Prices   | 1,837.1 | 2,008.4 | 2,101.8 | 2,164.3 | 2,265.9 | 2,293.3 | 2,381.6 | 2,388.7 | 2,462.4 | 2,514.0 | 2,614.9 |

# Table A-4.2: GDP 2012 r -2014 p — Current prices (Source: SIB, 2015)

|   |       |       | (\$Bz Mn) |
|---|-------|-------|-----------|
|   | 2012r | 2013r | 2014p     |
| Agriculture and forestry                  | 344.9 | 333.5 | 356.1     |
| Growing of crops; horticulture            | 273.0 | 253.2 | 257.8     |
| Livestock farming                         | 64.8  | 72.4  | 89.5      |
| Forestry and logging                      | 7.1   | 7.9   | 8.9       |
| Fishing                                   | 66.2  | 100.1 | 102.7     |
| Mining and quarrying                      | 15.1  | 15.0  | 14.0      |
| Primary industries                        | 426.2 | 448.5 | 472.9     |
| Manufacturing                             | 379.1 | 321.6 | 293.9     |
| Manuf. of food products and beverages     | 199.7 | 196.8 | 193.6     |
| Manuf. of textiles, clothing and footwear | 0.0   | 0.2   | 0.0       |
| Other manufacturing                       | 179.4 | 124.5 | 100.2     |
| Electricity and water supply              | 70.6  | 107.7 | 130.9     |
| Construction                              | 87.8  | 91.2  | 110.6     |
| Secondary industries                      | 537.6 | 520.4 | 535.3     |

\*\* r: reported, p: preliminary

# Table A-4.3: GDP by Activity: 2012 r -2014 p - current prices - contribution to GDP

|   |       |       | (%)   |
|---|-------|-------|-------|
|   | 2012r | 2013r | 2014p |
| Agriculture and forestry                | 10.96 | 10.26 | 10.37 |
| Growing of crops; horticulture          | 8.68  | 7.79  | 7.50  |
| Livestock farming                       | 2.06  | 2.23  | 2.60  |
| Forestry and logging                    | 0.23  | 0.24  | 0.26  |
| Fishing                                 | 2.10  | 3.08  | 2.99  |
| Mining and quarrying                    | 0.48  | 0.46  | 0.41  |
| Primary industries                      | 13.54 | 13.79 | 13.76 |
| Manufacturing                           | 12.05 | 9.89  | 8.55  |
| Manuf. of food products and beverages   | 6.35  | 6.05  | 5.64  |
| Man. of textiles, clothing and footwear | 0.54  | 0.01  | 0.00  |
| Other manufacturing                     | 5.70  | 3.83  | 2.92  |
| Electricity and water supply            | 2.24  | 3.31  | 3.81  |
| Construction                            | 2.79  | 2.80  | 3.22  |
| Secondary industries                    | 17.08 | 16.00 | 15.58 |

(Source: SIB, 2015)

# **ANNEX V: List of Tax Exempted Goods**

# Table A-5.1 Tax Exempted Goods



#### **Department of General Sales Tax** 2570 RATED GOODS



(TAXED AT ZERO PERCENT - NO GST ON THESE GOODS AS OF APRIL 1, 2010)

#### UNPROCESSED FOODS:

Rice Flour

Corn Fresh Meat (Mammal, Bird, or Fish) Edible Offal of Bovine Animals, Swine & Sheep Eggs Beans Fresh Fruits & Vegetables (Locally Produced) Salt Fresh Milk (Locally Produced) Tea

PROCESSED FOODS: Bread Corn & Flour Tortilla Sweet Bread & Bun (Locally Produced) Cooking Lard Margarine **Baby Formula** Sugar Condensed Milk Powdered Milk Cooking Oil Instant Coffee Chicken Sausages (Canned) Corned Beef (in Cans) Yeast Oats Luncheon Meat Potted Meat Chocolate Powdered Drinks Macaroni & Cheese Cereals Percolated Coffee Consumers:

Edible Meats of Swine Salted or in Brine (e.g. Pigtail) Edible Meats of Bovine Animals Salted or in Brine (e.g. Salt Beef)

Soup & Broth in Solid or Powdered Form (including Ramen) Preparations of Malt Extract

Any Live Bird, Fish, Crustacean, Mollusk or other Animal of a kind Generally Used as, or Producing, Food for Human Consumption

#### EDUCATIONAL ITEMS:

Notebooks/Exercise Books School Bags Pencils, Cravons, Lead Pencils, Erasers, Pencil Holders for Use in

Schools MEDICINE

Analoesics (Pain Killers - Liquids Tablets, Cappules or Solid Desage Forms for Oral or Rectal Use Cough & Cold Preparations (Liquid, Tablets, Capacity, Other Solid Dosage Forms for Oral or Nasal Use

Diagnostic Testing Kits And Devices to Test Glucose in Blood and Urine Insulin

Insulin Symples with Needles and Devices 700 Units

(1.0 Mi) Capacity, for the Administration of U-100 Insulin

**Oral Rehydration Salts & Solutions** of W.H.C. (Paramacopoeia Standards

Oxygen Dialysis Fluide Anti – Retroviral Medicines Vitamins and Supplements

#### HOUSEHOLD ITEMS/SUPPLIES:

Stoves/Rangers/Cookers Refrigerators (Domestic Use) Washing Machine (Domestic Use) Laundry Washing Soap Powder AGRICULTURE:

# Barbed Wire

Spare Parts for Tractors

Irrigation Pipes & Hoses Cable for Banana Industry Hatching Eggs **Concentrated Animal Feeds** (Bovine & Swine) Animal Feeds for Bird, Fish, Crustaceans, Mollusks & Other Animals Seed & Means of Propagation of

Plants Used to Produce Foods That are Zero-Rated

Sugar Cane Loading Machines

Land Preparation for Agriculture, Harvesting and Crop Dusting Services

Fertilizers, Pesticides, Fungicides and Herbicides

#### UTILITIES:

A Supply of Water (Other Than Bottled Water or Similar Containers) or Domestic Sewerage Services

Butane Gas for Domestic Use

#### OTHERS:

Frames for Eye Glasses

Look for the Green GST Registration Certificate when you enter a Store. Always, ask for your GST Tax Receipt Remember, every Retailer must utilize a programmable Cosh Register or Point of Sale System Contact Us At: Hotline - 222-5294; generals alestax@est Foulax, www.gst.gov.bc; Or Bureau of Standards, Hotline - 0800 283 5587

### **ANNEX VI: National Agriculture and Food Policy 2015-2920**

(Ministry of Agriculture/GOB/FAO, January, 2015)

#### National Agriculture and Food Policy 2015 -2020: Belize

#### **The Policy framework**

#### 1. The overall goal of the policy:

To engender that environment conducive to the development of an agriculture and food sector that is competitive, diversified and sustainable, that enhances food security and nutrition, and contributes to the achievement of the socio-economic development goals of Belize

#### 2. Guiding principles:

Consistency, partnership and solidarity, sustainability, entrepreneurship, accountability and transparency, equity and inclusiveness, social responsibility, targets and phasing.

#### 3. Pillars of the Policy

- Production, productivity and competitiveness enhancement;
- Market development, access and penetration;
- Food and Nutrition Security situation and improved rural livelihoods;
- Sustainable management systems and risk management; and
- Effective and efficient governance mechanisms

#### 4. National Targets

- Increase the agriculture and food sector average annual growth rate from the current average of 2.8 percent to 4.0 percent.
- Increase agriculture and food sector contribution to GDP in real terms from approximately 13.0 percent of GDP to 20 percent of GDP.
- Increase current average annual growth rate in agricultural exports from 4.2 percent to 5.5 percent.
- Reduce the current average rate of growth in imports from 5.8 percent to 3.5 percent with a heavy focus on import replacement commodities.
- Increase direct employment in the food and agriculture sector to 25 percent of total employed labour force.
- Increase real income of producer by 2.5 percent per year.
- Impact poverty, food and nutrition security and malnutrition.

# Agriculture Policy Framework Structure

| Pillar                  | Pillar 1:  | Pillar 2:  | Pillar 3  | Pillar 4  |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|---|
|                         | Production,<br>Productivity and<br>Competitive<br>Enhancement  | Market<br>Development,<br>Access and<br>Penetration  | National Food<br>and Nutrition<br>Security and<br>Improved Rural<br>Livelihoods   | Sustainable<br>Agriculture and<br>Risk Management   |
| Strategic<br>Objectives | <b>SO1.1</b> Rationalize<br>the regime of<br>investment<br>incentives for the<br>agriculture and food<br>sector.   | <b>SO2.1</b> Improve<br>the market<br>information and<br>intelligence<br>systems   | <b>SO3.1</b> Increase<br>production and<br>promote<br>diversification.  | <b>SO4.1</b> Promote best<br>practices in disaster<br>risk management<br>(DRM) and climate<br>change adaptation<br>(CCA).   |
|                         | <b>SO1.2</b> Promote the identification and prioritization of selective agriculture and food value chains and support the development of industry competitive investment plans | <b>SO2.2</b> Increase<br>access to<br>domestic and<br>external markets<br>by addressing<br>enabling<br>environment<br>constraints.       | <b>SO3.2</b> Promote livelihood options for the food and nutrition insecured.   | <ul> <li>SO4.2</li> <li>Create/strengthen pro-<br/>environment policies<br/>and institutions and<br/>promote integrated<br/>management of the<br/>environment.</li> <li>SO4.3 Support<br/>adaptation and<br/>mitigation strategies</li> </ul>     |
|                         | <b>SO1.3</b> Reform<br>agricultural<br>education and<br>training at all levels<br>to increase long-term<br>sector productivity   | SO2.3<br>Establish/strength<br>en linkages<br>between<br>agriculture and<br>tourism,<br>manufacturing<br>and health to<br>expand markets | <b>SO3.3</b> Increase<br>the participation<br>of youth and<br>women in the<br>development<br>process through<br>empowerment<br>programs | as a means of<br>enhancing the<br>stability of food and<br>nutrition security over<br>time among the<br>vulnerable groups as a<br>result of financial and<br>economic shocks.<br><b>SO4.4</b> Promote<br>strategies to combat<br>praedial larceny |
|                         | <b>SO1.4</b> Innovate and<br>generate technology<br>for competitiveness,<br>through Research<br>and Development  | <b>SO2.4</b> Promote innovative marketing of products, both in the domestic and export markets, targeting                                | <b>SO3.4</b> Promote<br>linkage of small<br>producers to<br>market  |   |
|                         | <ul> <li>SO1.5 Enhance<br/>extension services<br/>for improved<br/>technology transfer</li> <li>SO1.6 Improve the<br/>infrastructure to</li> </ul>                             | institutional and<br>household<br>consumers.   |   |   |
|                         | support increased<br>production and<br>improved<br>productivity  |  |   |   |

| Cross-<br>Cutting       | Governance  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
|                         | SO5.1 Strengthen institutional capacity for better delivery                                 |  |  |  |  |
| Strategic<br>Objectives | SO5.2 Strengthen institutional mechanisms and integration processes                         |  |  |  |  |
|                         | SO5.3 Strengthen capacities of national, regional and international cooperation partnership |  |  |  |  |
|                         | SO5.4 Promote access to reliable, timely and accurate information for decision making       |  |  |  |  |

# ANNEX VII: Weekly Average Retail Price BZ\$ for Agriculture Commodities

| Weekly Average Retail Price: 24th - 25th November, 2017 |                 |   |  |              |            |  |  |
|---|-----------------|---|--|--------------|------------|--|--|
| Product   | Unit of<br>Sale | Average Price<br>Today<br>24th - 25th<br>November, 2017 | Average Price<br>last week<br>17th-18th<br>November 2017 | Tendency     | Difference |  |  |
| BASIC GRAINS  |                 |   |  |              |            |  |  |
| Rice  | lb              | 1.23  | 1.23   | =            | 0.00       |  |  |
| RK Beans  | lb              | 1.96  | 1.96   | =            | 0.00       |  |  |
| Black Beans   | Ib              | 2.00  | 2.00   | =            | 0.00       |  |  |
| White Corn  | lb              | 0.44  | 0.44   | 1            | 0.01       |  |  |
| Yellow corn   | lb              | 0.43  | 0.42   | 1            | 0.01       |  |  |
| VEGETABLES  |                 |   |  |              |            |  |  |
| Celery  | lb              | 2.79  | 2.68   | 1 T          | 0.11       |  |  |
| Broccoli  | lb              | 3.36  | 3.21   | Î            | 0.14       |  |  |
| Yellow onion  | lb              | 2.07  | 2.04   | 1            | 0.04       |  |  |
| White onion   | lb              | 2.61  | 2.61   | =            | 0.00       |  |  |
| Habanero pepper   | lb              | 3.43  | 3.57   | Ļ            | -0.14      |  |  |
| Sweet Pepper  | lb              | 4.57  | 4.82   | $\downarrow$ | -0.25      |  |  |
| Head letucce  | Head            | 3.79  | 3.68   | 1            | 0.11       |  |  |
| Leaf Lettuce  | Head            | 2.50  | 2.50   | =            | 0.00       |  |  |
| Potato (clean)  | lb              | 1.57  | 1.54   | 1            | 0.04       |  |  |
| Potato (unwashed)                                       | lb              | #DIV/0!   | #DIV/0!  | #DIV/0!      | #DIV/0!    |  |  |
| Cucumber  | lb              | 0.96  | 1.04   | →            | -0.07      |  |  |
| Cabbage   | lb              | 1.39  | 1.39   | =            | 0.00       |  |  |
| Tomato (Table)  | lb              | 2.93  | 2.96   | Ļ            | -0.04      |  |  |
| Tomato (Roma)   | lb              | 2.44  | 2.69   | $\downarrow$ | -0.25      |  |  |
| Carrots   | lb              | 1.46  | 1.43   | 1 t          | 0.03       |  |  |
| FRUITS  |                 |   |  |              |            |  |  |
| Banana  | Unit            | 0.12  | 0.12   | =            | 0.00       |  |  |
| Banana (Apple)  | Unit            | 0.12  | 0.12   | =            | 0.00       |  |  |
| Coconut (dry)   | Unit            | 1.11  | 1.11   | =            | 0.00       |  |  |
| Lime  | Unit            | 0.21  | 0.22   | $\downarrow$ | -0.01      |  |  |
| Orange  | Unit            | 0.15  | 0.15   | 1            | 0.00       |  |  |
| Papaya (Tainong)  | Unit            | 3.55  | 3.70   | →            | -0.15      |  |  |
| Pineapple   | Unit            | 3.11  | 3.07   | ↑            | 0.04       |  |  |
| Plantain (green)  | Unit            | 0.30  | 0.30   | =            | 0.00       |  |  |
| Plantain (ripe)   | Unit            | 0.29  | 0.31   | ↓            | -0.02      |  |  |
| ROOTCROPS   |                 |   |  |              |            |  |  |
| Cassava   | lb              | 1.00  | 1.04   | Ļ            | -0.04      |  |  |
| Coco yam  | lb              | 1.75  | 1.75   | =            | 0.00       |  |  |
| Sweet potato  | lb              | 1.50  | 1.46   | Ť            | 0.04       |  |  |
| MEATS   |                 |   |  |              |            |  |  |
| Whole Chicken   | lb              | 2.70  | 2.70   | =            | 0.00       |  |  |
| Whole Fish  | lb              | 6.68  | 6.68   | =            | 0.00       |  |  |
| Egg   | Dozen           | 3.43  | 3.43   | =            | 0.00       |  |  |
| Honey   | Quart           | 13.14   | 12.86  | ↑            | 0.29       |  |  |
| Beef  | lb              | 6.75  | 6.75   | =            | 0.00       |  |  |
| Pork  | lb              | 5.89  | 5.68   | 1            | 0.21       |  |  |

Exchange rate: BZ \$2.00 = US \$1.00
# **ANNEX VIII: List of Priority Commodities**

# Ministry of Agriculture, Belize, July 2017

#### **Traditional Commodities**

- 1. Sugar cane
- 2. Citrus
- 3. Banana

#### Grains:

- 1. Corn (yellow and white)
- 2. Beans (RK, Black and Blackeye)
- 3. Soybeans
- 4. Sorghum
- 5. Rice (milpa, mechanized irrigated, mechanized rainfed)

### **Vegetables:**

- 6. Onion
- 7. Potato
- 8. Carrots
- 9. Tomato
- 10. Sweet pepper
- 11. Habanero pepper
- 12. Cabbage
- 13. Celery
- 14. Lettuce
- 15. Cauliflower
- 16. Broccoli

# Meats and Dairy:

- 17. Poultry
- 18. Beef
- 19. Pork
- 20. Eggs
- 21. Sheep
- 22. Honey/beekeeping products
- 23. Milk

#### **Fruit Tree:**

- 24. Coconut
- 25. Soursop

# Others

- 1. Aquaculture (Tilapia)
- 2. Tumeric
- 3. Yellow Ginger;
- 4. Plantain.

# ANNEX IX: Strategic Management and Planning. Ministry of Agriculture, July 2017

| Elements             | Narrative Description   |  |  |  |  |  |
|----------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| GSDS                 | The Growth and Sustainable Development Strategy (GSDS) states that the overarching goal of the Government of Belize is "to improve                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| overarching          | the quality of life for all Belizeans, living now and in the future".   |  |  |  |  |  |
| goal:                |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| GSDS focus area      | Of the four CSF that will achieve the overarching goal, the Ministry identifies the CSF1 "optimal national income and investment" as the              |  |  |  |  |  |
| coinciding with      | specific area where it can contribute significantly to this goal through the following Necessary Conditions and actions outlined in the               |  |  |  |  |  |
| agriculture          | GSDS:   |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | NC1.1 Penetrate export markets  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSF-Critical Success | <ul> <li>Action 3: Achieve adequate standards and technical requirements for exports.</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NC – Necessary       | <ul> <li>NC1.3.1 Improved competitiveness (including small firms and traditional sectors)</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condition            | <ul> <li>Action 3: Continue efforts to improve productivity and viability of the sugar, banana and citrus industries and other traditional</li> </ul> |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | sectors.  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Action 4: Engage the private sector in discussing opportunities for expanding traditional agricultural production</li> </ul>                 |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>NC1.3.4 Inclusive Growth (Growth and Equity)</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Action 11: Identify and develop activities that can provide significant employment and earning opportunities to the poor and</li> </ul>      |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | the vulnerable population.  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>NC1.3.5 Technological adaptation and innovation (including green technology)</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Action 14: Build institutional capacity to encourage technological adaptation and innovation.</li> </ul>                                     |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | NC1.3.7 Prioritized Sectors   |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Action 32: Strengthen linkages between tourism and other sectors including agriculture and pursue rural development through</li> </ul>       |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | tourism   |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Action 34: Develop a comprehensive strategy for increasing agricultural production and productivity.</li> </ul>                              |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Action 35: Significantly increase drainage and irrigation infrastructure, both on-farm and off-farm, and develop the necessary</li> </ul>    |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | information tools(/base).   |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Action 38: Enhance research and extension services capabilities, especially with regard to identifying and supporting livestock</li> </ul>   |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | production, the cultivation of non-traditional crops and new agro-processing activity.  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Action 39: Strengthen the agricultural marketing system.</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Action 40: Improve support systems and infrastructure to achieve greater exports of agricultural commodities.</li> </ul>                     |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Action 41: Development of infrastructure and enhanced systems to facilitate more efficient agricultural production,</li> </ul>               |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | processing, and better packaging and handling for export as well as for domestic supply.  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | • Action 42: Encourage and facilitate increased cooperation among farmers and communities with regard to production, land                             |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | preparation, harvesting, transportation, storage, marketing, on-farm irrigation and drainage, sourcing inputs including labor,                        |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | among others  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | • Action 44: Enhance efforts aimed at reducing risk and achieving greater agricultural resilience to weather-related disasters and                    |  |  |  |  |  |
|                      | climate change.   |  |  |  |  |  |

|                 | <ul> <li>Action 45: Establish adequate skills for the development of agriculture</li> </ul>   |                                  |   |                       |                      |
|-----------------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------|----------------------|
|                 | • Action 46: Mount a program to increase attractiveness of agriculture as an employment/business option.                            |                                  |   |                       |                      |
|                 |   |                                  | с і <i>,</i>                                |                       |                      |
|                 |   |                                  |   |                       |                      |
| Vision of       | An Agriculture and Food S   | ector that is innovative, compe  | titive, diversified and sustainable         |                       |                      |
| Agriculture:    |   |                                  |   |                       |                      |
| Mission of      | To grow and continue as a   | key economic pillar, ensuring    | food and nutrition security, diversifying b | usiness opportunitie  | es, reducing poverty |
| Agriculture:    | and enhancing human res   | ources capacity in a sustainable | e and competitive environment               |                       |                      |
|                 |   | · /                              |   |                       |                      |
| Overall goal of | Position the agricultural se  | ector to contribute more to the  | e economy, foreign exchange earnings and    | d savings, generate g | greater              |
| Agriculture:    | employment, expand business opportunities in a sustainable manner   |                                  |   |                       |                      |
| 5               |   |                                  |   |                       |                      |
|                 |   |                                  |   |                       |                      |
| National        | i. Sector Growth Rate   | – The average annual sector g    | rowth rate increased from the current av    | erage of 2.8 % to 4.0 | )%;                  |
| Targets         | ii. GDP – The Agriculture and Food Sector's contribution to GDP increased in real terms from approximately 13.0 % of GDP to 20 % of |                                  |   |                       |                      |
| (agricultural   | GDP;  |                                  |   |                       |                      |
| sector) as      | iii. Exports – The average annual growth rate in agricultural exports increased from 4.2 % to 5.5 %:                                |                                  |   |                       |                      |
| outlined in     | iv. Imports – The average rate of growth in imports of food commodities decreased from 5.8 % to 3.5 % with a heavy focus on import  |                                  |   |                       |                      |
| NAFP 2015-      | replacement commodities:  |                                  |   |                       |                      |
| 2030:           | v. Direct Employment  | - The direct employment in th    | e Agriculture and Food Sector increased t   | o 25 % of total emp   | loyed labor force;   |
|                 | vi. Real Income – The r   | real income of producers increa  | ased by 2.5 % per year;                     |                       | , ,                  |
|                 | vii. Poverty – Poverty reduced through agriculture's contribution to improved livelihoods:  |                                  |   |                       |                      |
|                 | viii. Food and Nutrition  | – Food and nutrition increased   | , resulting in a decrease in malnutrition;  |                       |                      |
|                 | ix. Agriculture workforce – The productivity of the agricultural workforce increased: and   |                                  |   |                       |                      |
|                 | x. Governance – The management and governance capacity within the agriculture sector increased.                                     |                                  |   |                       |                      |
|                 |   |                                  |   |                       |                      |
|                 |   |                                  |   |                       |                      |
| Pillars of the  | Pillars   | Thematic Areas                   | Specific focus areas                        | Lead Officer          | Alternate            |
| NAFP 2015-      | i. Production,  | 1. Diversification;              | Beekeeping/honey                            | B. Esquivel,          | M. Trujillo, NCC     |
| 2030, Thematic  | productivity and  | value addition;                  | Sheep Production                            | DOE                   |                      |
| areas and focus | competitive   |                                  | Beef Cattle                                 |                       |                      |
| areas           | enhancement;  |                                  | Swine, Poultry, Aquaculture,                |                       |                      |
|                 |   |                                  | Fruit tree (Coconut, soursop,               |                       |                      |
|                 |   |                                  | avocado) expansion; vegetables,             |                       |                      |
|                 |   |                                  | grains, pulses,                             |                       |                      |
|                 |   |                                  | Value addition,                             |                       |                      |
|                 |   |                                  | Agro-processing                             |                       |                      |

|                       | -  |   |  |  |                         |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|--|-------------------------|
|                       |  | Agriculture Health;   | Pest and diseases, Traceability,<br>Phyto sanitary services, Quarantine,<br>Bio-safety, Ambulatory Services,<br>Legislation and regulation   | E. Cruz, BAHA<br>MD  | D. Castillo, NLC        |
|                       |  | Science & Technology  | Research, Development and<br>Innovation, covered structure,<br>fertigation, soil management, plant<br>nutrition; IPM, germplasm banks  | I. Sanchez, R&I<br>Dir                                     | D. Gillett, M&E         |
|                       | ii. Market<br>development,<br>access and<br>penetration;   | 2. Institutional<br>strengthening – database<br>management and market<br>intelligence system;   | Statistical data and information,<br>forecasting, market information,<br>farmgate prices, market prices,<br>organization.  | M. Matus,<br>Policy Analyst<br>& G. Murillo,<br>Registrar. | F. Garnett, DAC<br>S/C  |
|                       | iii. National Food and<br>Nutrition Security<br>and improved rura<br>livelihoods;  | 3. Food and Nutrition<br>Security   | Backyard and school gardens to<br>support school nutrition programs,<br>institutional strengthening, food<br>security data and information   | E. Montero,<br>NCFNSC                                      | F. Palacio, DAC<br>O/W  |
|                       | iv. Sustainable<br>agriculture and ris<br>management;  | 4. Water management and climate change  | Irrigation systems, drainage<br>infrastructure, wáter harvesting,<br>land mapping, climate Smart<br>agriculture, disaster recovery fund,<br>renewable energy (solar, hydraulic),<br>Resilience building                    | V. Pascual,<br>WM/CC Dir                                   | G. Ramirez,<br>NHC      |
|                       | v. Governance –<br>accountability,<br>transparency and<br>coordination.  | 5. Strategic management and planning  | Programming, projectizing,<br>Monitoring framework, Evaluation,<br>Results based budgeting, change<br>management, communication,<br>coordination, Legislation &<br>Regulation; accountability seminars,<br>annual reports. | A. Harrison,<br>CAO/ Matus,<br>Policy<br>Analyst/SMT       | C. Martinez,<br>DAC Cyo |
| Main                  | National Livestock Prog  | am: National Horticulture Drogr   | am: National Crops and Fruit Trop Prov   | Tram National Ag   | aculturo Brogram:       |
| Programmes            | National Agro-processing   | National Livestock Program; National Horticulture Program; National Crops and Fruit Tree Program, National Aquaculture Program;<br>National Agro-processing Program |  |  |                         |
| Support<br>Programmes | National Extension Service Program; National Research and Innovation Program; Cooperative Program; Central Farm Agriculture Station<br>and satellite stations; M&E National Food Security and Nutrition Program; Water Mgnt and Climate Change Program; Strategic Planning;<br>Policy and Statistics |   |  |  |                         |

# ANNEX X: Key Supporting Departments and Agencies in the Coastal Zone and Marine Sector

#### Ministry of Economic Development, Petroleum, Investment, Trade & Commerce

The Ministry of Economic Development, Petroleum, Investment, Trade & Commerce has responsibility for:

- Capital Budget Preparation and Management
- Corozal Free Zone
- Development Finance Corporation
- Development Finance Institutions and Multilateral Financing Agencies
- Economic Development Planning
- Public Sector Investment Programme Planning
- Social Investment Fund, and the
- Statistical Institute of Belize

#### Belize Customs and Excise Department

#### Comptroller's message:

"The role of the Belize Customs and Excise Department is to develop and implement an integrated set of policies and procedures that ensure increased safety and security, as well as developing the necessary platform to promote effective trade facilitation and revenue collection". <u>http://custom.gov.bz.</u>

A list of Zero Rated goods or imported goods that are tax exempted can be seen in Annex IV

#### Belize Trade and Investment Development Service

Belize Trade & Investment Development Service (*BELTRAIDE*) is a statutory body of the Ministry of Economic Development, Petroleum, Investment, Trade & Commerce of the Government of Belize. BELTRAIDE is charged with attracting highly qualified investments, developing small and medium enterprises, as well as, promoting "Made in Belize" products.

Its Mission is to enhance Belize's prosperity by fostering investor confidence, entrepreneurship, business growth and innovation. BELTRAIDE comprises of three departments, namely:

#### Protective Area Conservation Trust

The Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT) is a statutory body that was established by the Government of Belize in 1995 and governed by the Protected Areas Conservation Trust Act, following several years of consultation with various non-governmental organizations, government departments, the private sector and international conservation organizations. PACT opened its door in June 1996, having been endorsed through the USAID project in Belize on developing a National Protected Areas System Plan (NARMAP 1995).

PACT contributes to the sustainable management and development of Belize's natural and cultural heritage by providing financial support for protected areas. PACT is a bold and innovative strategy for non-traditional revenue generation and is primarily financed from collection of a conservation fee paid by

visitors upon departure from the country and receives a 20% commission from cruise ship passenger fees. Additionally, at least 5% of all revenues are deposited in an endowment fund, and also receives donations from individuals, foundations and corporation.

#### *National Meteorological Service (Meteorology Department)*

The National Meteorological Service of Belize is the leading governmental authority in the field of weather and climate. The mission of the Meteorology Department is to provide meteorological and climate-based products and services through systematic and accurate monitoring and data collection, reliable data analysis and timely dissemination of user-friendly information and bulletins on regular and emergency events and processes. The objective is to contribute to the safety and well-being of the People of Belize and the sustainable development of the country.

Belize is a member of the World Meteorological Organization and serves as the national focal point for the Inter Governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The National Meteorological Service has representation on the National Emergency Management Organization (NEMO), the national Environmental Appraisal Committee, the Belize national Climate Change Committee, to name a few. More information on the activities and services provided by the National Meteorological Services can be accessed from:

www.hydromet.gov.bz/.

#### Forest Department

The Forest Department is the institutional body charged with the management of the country's forests, specifically forests on national lands and forest reserves, including the clearing of mangrove forests in the Coastal Zone (GOB/MNRE, 2010). The Forest Department is authorized to issue and regulate licenses on these lands; it is also responsible for administering approximately half of all existing protected areas and is the focal point for several international conventions including CITES, UNCBD, and the RAMSAR convention on wet lands (Forest Department, 2006). The main legal instrument empowering the Forest Department is the 1927 Forests Act.

#### Department of the Environment

The Department of the Environment was legally enacted through the Environmental Protection Act of 1992, amended in 2009 with new regulations.

| d Functions | Develop new regulations &<br>standards for prevention &<br>control of pollution  | Promote long-term<br>sustainable development &<br>incorporation of ecological<br>concerns in the economic<br>development process | Identify environmental<br>issues & develop solutions &<br>policies related to proper<br>sustainable management of<br>the natural resources                    |
|-------------|--|--|---|
|             | Work with project<br>proponents (public &<br>private to ensure that<br>projects are implemented &<br>developed in an<br>environmental, technical &<br>sustainably sound manner | To have effective<br>compliance monitoring<br>capability to ensure<br>compliance with<br>environmental laws                      | To foster an appreciation of<br>the national resources &<br>importance of a healthy<br>environment to aid in<br>poverty alleviation &<br>economic development |
| Legislate   | Develop & c<br>strong intra/in<br>cooperation<br>addressing en<br>issu   | coordinate<br>Iter-sectorial<br>essential in<br>vironmental<br>es  | cal, regional & agencies & ations on ental issues   |

# Legislative functions of the Department of the Environment, Belize 2014

*Vision:* To be leaders in environmental stewardship for sustainable development both nationally &regionally.

*Mission:* To ensure that Belize's development is sound through effective environmental management for present & future generations.

#### Environmental Protection and Sustainable Development

"The Environmental Protection Act (EPA) requires EIAs to be prepared by all persons who intend to undertake projects that may significantly affect the environment, and to follow the rules as set out in the EIA regulations..." (Brief guide to Environmental Clearance Process, DOE Brochure, 2015). http://www.doe.gov.bz

#### The Belize Coast Guard

In accordance with the Belize National Coast Guard Service (Amendment) Act, 2016, provision was made for a change of name to the Belize Coast Guard, and clarification of duties and functions.

Subject to the provision of the Act, the Coast Guard is employed as military service organization, being the naval force for the defence of Belize, in relation to its maritime areas with powers to assist in enforcement of any laws relating to: fisheries protection; marine resources and environmental protection; safety of navigation including inland waterways and aids to navigation; maritime pollution, enforcement of maritime convention, among many others.

#### Pan American Development Foundation

The Pan American Development Foundation (PADF) has been working in Belize since January 2014. PADF provides community-based programme that generate economic opportunities, advance social progress, and help prepare for respond to disasters. In Southern Belize, the focus is on preparing for the effects of climate change through capacity building and training. Recent partners include the Government of Taiwan, the U.S. Embassy in Belize, the Government of Belize, the private sector, civil society organizations, the Belize Trade and Investment Development Service (BELTRAIDE), and the Organization of American States.

#### Fishing and Marine Products Co-operatives

A co-operative is an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs and aspiration through a jointly-owned and democratically-controlled enterprise (Department of Co-operatives, 2013). Co-operatives are enterprises that put people at the centre of their business rather than capital. In Belize, there are co-operative societies engaged in various economic sectors.

The existing co-operatives in Fishing and Marine sub-sectors are: National Fishermen, Northern Fishermen, Placencia Producers, and the Rio Grande Fishermen Co-operative.