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Counterfeiting is a challenge with global reach that spans multiple sectors; agricultural input sectors in Africa are not immune.

**Global Value Lost Due to Counterfeiting**

- **2008**: $775 Billion
- **2013**: $1,468 Billion

CAGR: 13.6%

**Value Lost Due to Counterfeiting: Agricultural Input Sectors in Africa**

- **Crop Protection**: $800 Million
- **Seed**: $500 Million
- **Fertilizer**: $1,000 Million

Counterfeit estimates range from 15% (of total product sales) in some African markets up to 50% in others.

**Counterfeit Agricultural Inputs: Prevalence in Africa**

- **Rwanda**: ICT to Fight Fake Agriculture Inputs (November 2013)
- **Kenya**: Fake Maize Seeds Worry South Sudan Minister (October 2013)
- **Tanzania**: Amends Law to Curb Fake Fertilizers (October 2012)
- **Cocoa Farmers**: Advised to Desist from Using Fake Pesticides (March 2012)

- **30%** Unlicensed or Smuggled Pesticides on Sale in Ghana
- **40%** Estimate of Fake Seed Packets in Kenya
- **30%** Counterfeit Hybrid High-Yielding Variety Seeds in Ugandan Market

Source: 
- (1) BASCAP (2011); (2) Frost and Sullivan Research (2013); FAOSTAT; Hernandez and Torero (2011); Monitor Deloitte Analysis; (3) CropLife Middle East Africa (2011); (4) Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (2012); (5) Joughin (2014)
Counterfeiting in Africa’s agricultural input sectors takes multiple forms – from imitation branding and packaging to partially diluted or entirely fake products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Package</th>
<th>Producer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic</td>
<td>Authentic</td>
<td>Authentic</td>
<td>Licensed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diluted</td>
<td>Imitation</td>
<td>Re-used</td>
<td>Unlicensed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expired</td>
<td>No Brand (Un-labeled)</td>
<td>Tampered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples of Counterfeit Agricultural Inputs**

- **Counterfeit Label and Bags**
  - **Counterfeiters change Roundup to RoundAll and fill with fake product**

- **Re-used Brand Packaging**
  - **Yara Int’l fertilizer bags were re-packaged and sold with counterfeit product**

- **Expired Products**
  - **Farmers in Northern Ghana lost several hectares of cotton after using expired pesticides**

- **Unlicensed Producers**
  - **Approximately 50% of seed companies in Uganda are unlicensed**

Source: (1) Bloch, Kisitu, Gita (2013); (2) Kazoka (2012); (3) Ghana Web (2007);
Smallholder farmers in Africa face significant challenges as a result of using counterfeit agricultural inputs

Reduction in Income
Farmers who use counterfeit agricultural inputs risk significant crop damage, directly impacting their income

Health and Safety
Untested and often dangerous crop protection products pose food safety, environmental, and health issues

Access to Genuine Inputs
Trustworthy agro dealers are forced out of the market when they cannot compete with cheap, counterfeit manufacturers – forcing some farmers to travel further for genuine inputs

Trust in Genuine Inputs
After continuing to buy counterfeits, farmers may lose trust in the efficacy of genuine inputs

“Farmers can lose an entire season to counterfeit products”
-- DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

“There isn’t the same sort of consumer protection... we’re not talking about an FDA that monitors these issues”
-- DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

“Margins are often higher on the fake or low-quality products”
-- IMPORTER

“It is important to find champions in farming communities... A lot of them already don’t trust us”
-- INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION
Furthermore, manufacturers lose significant value annually to counterfeit agricultural inputs across the markets studied.

Value Lost Due to Counterfeiting

- **Maize Seed**
  - Estimated losses are between $0.9M to $1.4M

- **Herbicide**
  - Estimated losses are between $12M to $21.5M

- **Maize**
  - Estimated losses are between $3.9M to $6.0M

- **Herbicide**
  - Estimated losses are between $6.3M to $15.4M

- **Inorganic Fertilizer**
  - Estimated losses are between $0.5M to $1M

**Methodology**

**Maize Seed**: The size of seed markets in Uganda and Ghana is based on secondary research. We have applied the estimated level of counterfeiting to hybrids and OPVs separately, based on stakeholder interviews. To calculate the final estimated losses, average market prices of seed types were applied.

**Herbicide**: The total market size is based on secondary research. The primary driver of counterfeiting is bottle reuse, which was the primary rate applied to calculate total value lost. All other counterfeit activities were estimated based on stakeholder interviews in-country.

**Inorganic Fertilizer**: Market data was available through AMITSA; the calculation was only done for Uganda. Counterfeiting primarily affects smallholders, a very small segment of the market. We have estimated and applied the counterfeit rate to the total market.

**Sources**: Joughin; IFPRI (Uganda Fertilizer and Ghana seed sector studies); stakeholder interviews; Monitor Deloitte analysis
To better understand the challenge of counterfeiting, we studied maize seeds and herbicide in Ghana, and herbicides, maize seeds and inorganic fertilizer in Uganda.

The selection of these value chains was based on an analysis that assess the following criteria: relevance to smallholder farmers, size of the category, profitability of the category, role of the government, and prevalence of counterfeiting.

Proposed Value Chain Selection:

**Ghana**

- Maize Seeds
- Herbicide

**Uganda**

- Herbicide
- Inorganic Fertilizer

Note: Maize seed was also added to the analysis in order to compare insights across geographies.
Similarly, among the value chains studied in Uganda we learned that counterfeiting prevalence is highest within the herbicide market, followed by the maize seed market and the fertilizer market.

**Summary of Prevalence of Counterfeiting Across Value Chains Studied**

The prevalence of counterfeiting is highest within herbicides. Counterfeiting in maize seeds – especially among hybrid varieties – is also prevalent, but less so than in herbicides. Smallholder farmers rarely use fertilizer and therefore counterfeiting is not as prevalent as in the other two value chains (but remains a recognized issue).

**Summary of Types of Counterfeiting**

### Herbicides
- **Mislabeled / Sub-standard Product** in which the label does not reflect contents in the bottle (often Chinese imports)
- **Label Reuse / Sub-standard Product** in which a premium product’s label is placed on a bottle of sub-standard product
- **Bottle Reuse / Adulterated Product** in which premium bottles are refilled with diluted or fake product
- **Label Imitation / Sub-standard or Adulterated Product** in which a premium brand is imitated, but the product is sub-standard or adulterated

### Maize Seeds
- **Mislabeled / Diluted Seed** in which seed growers “top-up” orders with grains in order to meet contracted amount or mobile salesmen sell grains mixed with seeds out of the back of trucks
- **Label Imitation / Adulterated or Sub-standard Seed** in which imitation packages of leading seed companies are produced and filled with grain and/or fake seeds
- **Label Reuse / Adulterated Seed** in which agro dealers acquire and re-use bags of reputable seed companies

### Fertilizer
- **Mislabeled / Underweight Product** in which fertilizer is removed from bag and then the bag is resealed
- **Mislabeled / Diluted Product** in which agro-dealers dilute fertilizer with ash or sand during re-packaging
- **Mislabeled / Adulterated Product** in which large packages are broken into smaller packages and fake materials are placed in the small packages
Counterfeiting activities across the value chains studied are primarily the result of four root causes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root Cause</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Package Integrity across Distribution Chain</td>
<td>There are many points of intermediation along the value chain within Africa’s agricultural input sectors, and often a high degree of fragmentation; it is thus difficult for manufacturers to track the product flow along the value chain, and difficult for end consumers to authenticate the source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Manufacturers Willingness to Intervene</td>
<td>Many European manufacturers of agricultural inputs (namely, CPPs and fertilizers) are not investing in African markets; as a result, they do not conduct demand planning, manage inventory, or ensure channel accountability beyond the point at which product is sold to importers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Smallholder Context/Behaviour</td>
<td>It is very difficult for smallholder farmers to determine if a product has been adulterated (diluted or fake) or if it is a sub-standard product (expired or poor quality) based on the label alone; labels and bottles are often tampered with and reused, and the product itself may look and smell the same as an authentic product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Distribution Chain Actors’ Behaviour</td>
<td>The profit potential of dealing counterfeit products motivates ill-intentions within actors across the value chain; weak enforcement of regulation means that actors who behave illegally are rarely caught and prosecuted. When prosecution occurs, existing fees and punishment do not serve to deter commitment of further crimes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are six solution archetypes that could address the challenge of counterfeiting; the primary focus of this engagement was on scalable technologies funded by manufacturers.

### Solution Archetypes to Address Counterfeiting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>End-User Authentication</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Quality Assurance / Certified Channels</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Smallholder Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> End consumers verify that an agricultural input was produced by a credible, certified manufacturer; solution leverages either coin-scratch labels or holograms as the medium to conceal PIN code, and mobile phone (text or call) to authenticate source.</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> The quality of the product is assured through independent testing, and actors along the value chain are certified to distribute the product; solution would require an external evaluator to test the product at each point of intermediation in the value chain.</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Smallholder farmers are provided training platforms focused on the importance and value of genuine inputs, methods of detecting counterfeit products, and agricultural input purchasing best practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Point Solution Evaluated:** Coin Scratch & Mobile Authentication  
**Point Solution Evaluated:** Mobile Testing Kits  
**Point Solution Evaluated:** Information Collection & Dissemination Platform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Track-and-Trace Technologies</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Product, Package, or Channel Investment</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Regulatory Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Manufacturers verify the movement of an input at each point along the value chain; solution leverages either RFID tags (passive or active) or barcode applications (2D or QR codes).</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Manufacturers invest in direct access to the channel (e.g., build local import facilities and distribution centers); or invest in product innovation that is difficult to counterfeit (e.g., seed dyes) or invest in package innovation (e.g., smaller packs).</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Government regulatory agencies are equipped to set high quality standards for the manufacture and distribution of agricultural inputs, conduct random product testing, investigate sources of counterfeiting on an ongoing basis, and enforce regulations effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Point Solutions Evaluated:** Barcode Applications, Inventory Management Platform, and RFID tags  
**Examples listed in appendix**

Solutions related to end-user authentication, quality assurance / certified channels, track & trace technologies, and smallholder education were the primary focus of this research.
We have assessed six leading solutions that have been effective in other industries to tackle counterfeiting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solutions to Tackling Counterfeiting</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Assessment of Viability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BARCODE APPLICATIONS</strong></td>
<td>Unique product information is encoded on barcodes, which are affixed to the product and scanned at each step of the value chain</td>
<td>Requires significant process change; each actor needs to use scanners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufactures are able to track product flow through value chain</td>
<td>Expensive to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOBILE TESTING KITS</strong></td>
<td>Product is tested for quality at each stage of value chain by an external evaluator; agro dealers are independently certified to distribute agricultural inputs</td>
<td>Requires significant investment in testing infrastructure and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Addresses all types of counterfeiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COIN SCRATCH &amp; MOBILE AUTHENTICATION</strong></td>
<td>End consumers verify the product was produced by a credible, certified manufacturer (via coin-scratch labels &amp; SMS)</td>
<td>Very effective solution when package integrity is maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enables source authentication; eliminates bottle/label reuse</td>
<td>Low cost to implement and operate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMATION DISSEMINATION PLATFORM</strong></td>
<td>Farmer reports incidence of counterfeiting to hotline; data is aggregated and pushed back out to subscribers periodically</td>
<td>Very effective to tackle counterfeiting when scale has been achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enables farmers to learn from each other – network effects</td>
<td>Potential for garbage in, garbage out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVENTORY MANAGEMENT PLATFORM</strong></td>
<td>Agro dealers assess product inventory and notify manufacturers of stock levels through mobile application</td>
<td>Requires significant process change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primarily addresses root cause of counterfeiting: stock-outs</td>
<td>Addresses only one root cause of counterfeiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RFID TAGS</strong></td>
<td>Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) tag is affixed to product, crate, or pallet; RFID reader uses radio waves to wirelessly scan tag when product comes within close proximity</td>
<td>Requires significant investment in RFID tags and RFID scanners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology can be unreliable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- **End User Authentication**
- **Track-and-Trace Technologies**
- **Smallholder Education**
- **Quality Assurance**

Very Ineffective | Very Effective
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The farmer scratches the label to reveal a unique fourteen digit code, sends to *114# and then receives a response with the product’s detailed specifics.

1. Check product for verification code
2. Enter verification code
3. Instantly verify if a product is genuine

Genuine Certified Product
Made by: Quality Chemicals
Qty: 2L
Expiry: 20/12/2016
Batch 00011
Availability of high-quality inputs

Prevalence of counterfeit inputs
What e-verification DOES

- Assures customer that the product is from the supplier
- Prevents package re-use and adulteration
- Gives Brand visibility
- Provides inventory tracking to last mile without necessitating cooperation of retailers and distributors
- Holds Brand owners accountable and removes counterfeits as an excuse for poor quality

What e-verification DOES NOT

- Guarantee the quality of the product inside the package
- Solve problem of sales out of open containers
- Address home saved seed and informal seed suppliers

FEED THE FUTURE
The U.S. Government’s Global Hunger & Food Security Initiative

USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE
Deciding Factors

• What do the stakeholders want?
• What services are they willing to pay for?
• What will the Government allow?
• What are the costs of making a mistake?
Wait a minute! ...or a few months

Know it's real
Scratch Panel and Sms code to 5050
Let your harvest improve, get yourself the right agro inputs today, E-verify
• Liaise with potential suppliers
• Interface with Government
• Support consumer education and promotion
• Support market entrance to help providers get up to commercially viable scale
Great Expectations

- More than 30 million Ugandans rely on the ag supply chain
- Fake seeds alone erase $1.5 billion a year in yields and incomes
- E-verification hopes to
  - empower 5 million Ugandan farmers plus agro-retailers
  - generate more than $1 billion a year
- Beyond ag? Possibilities are almost endless
Thank You
When a farmer buys a product, s/he sends the attached unique 14 digit code to the UNBS code *114# for verification.

SYSTEM SIDE
• MAAIF lists of certified agro inputs, manufacturers uploaded
• System updates
• Logs
• Reports
• Code verifications, etc.

MAAIF given report and its enforcement team conducts an onsite assessment of the product to enforce the law.

CALL CENTER
1. System submits numbers to call center to follow up cases of products with invalid codes.
2. Call center contacts farmer when an invalid code is sent, to obtain details of the product and location of purchase.
3. Farmer can call a toll free to the call center in case SMS doesn’t match in the details of products purchased.
4. Call center forwards reports to coordination center with the particulars

UNBS E-TAG SYSTEM DATABASE

UNBS CO-ORDINATION CENTRE

AGRO-INPUT MANUFACTURER APPROVED BY MAAIF
1. UNBS E-tag shares real time reports and updates with the certified manufacturer through web portal (e.g. if sub-standard products are detected)
2. Manufacturer updates its account on the E-tag system

Unique code sent to *114#.
SMS reply that product is genuine and certified by MAAIF.
SMS reply that
1. Product is not genuine
2. Code is reused
3. Code is invalid
4. Product is expired
**ABOUT E-TAG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABOUT E-TAG</th>
<th>The System</th>
<th>The Farmer</th>
<th>Manufacturer’s benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The non-forgeable electronic tag system, has been designed to empower farmers to conclusively detect forgeries of trademarks and quality marks, using their personal mobile phone handsets, during the process of purchasing goods.</td>
<td>The system is run on a centralized ICT program that locks out counterfeiters from the market of a given product, that has been electronically tagged with unique codes, by alerting the purchasing farmer and MAAIF whenever the farmer electronically encounters a counterfeit from anywhere in Uganda with a mobile phone network.</td>
<td>Farmers will use their mobile phones to verify if a product is genuine or not at the point of sale or on the farm. In case of an invalid/fake code or reused codes encountered on a counterfeit by the farmer, UNBS shall be alerted automatically. An assessment is done on the location and particulars of the counterfeit, enabling a quick response reaction from the MAAIF surveillance team.</td>
<td>Agro input manufacturers on the system will recover and maintain markets lost to counterfeiters thus increasing turnover while increasing farmer confidence and satisfaction. The system is transparent as it sends real time reports enabling an affected manufacturer to get involved when counterfeiters are detected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continue the conversation

Comment on today’s topic: http://agrilinks.org/events/e-verification-agricultural-inputs-progress-uganda

Tweet tips! twitter.com/agrilinks

Post resources! facebook.com/agrilinks